

THE JACOBEOAN AND
CAROLINE STAGE

THE JACOBEOAN
AND
CAROLINE STAGE

*DRAMATIC COMPANIES
AND PLAYERS*

BY
GERALD EADES BENTLEY

VOLUME I

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E C. 4

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS CAPE TOWN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

FIRST EDITION 1941

Reprinted photographically in Great Britain
at the University Press, Oxford, in 1949,
from sheets of the first edition

PREFACE

My purpose is to carry on the admirable survey made by Sir Edmund Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage* from 1616, his terminal date, to the closing of the theatres in 1642. These first two volumes set forth the history of the London dramatic companies and the biographies of the actors of that period. I shall continue with later volumes on the plays and playwrights and on the theatres and conditions of play production.

My general method has been to consider first the dramatic companies performing in London before the death of Shakespeare, taking them up roughly in the order of their importance, and then the later companies, which are treated in the order of their first appearance. For each of the older companies I have summarized as concisely as possible their histories before 1616; these summaries have nothing original about them but are simply condensed from *The Elizabethan Stage*. At the end of each chapter ~~there~~ ^{one} is appended a series of lists and tables intended to make more accessible the essential facts of the company's history.

In the section on the actors I have departed from the method of Chambers, Collier, Nungezer, and other biographers of the Elizabethan actors. I have felt—since the chief users of this section of the book are likely to be scholars who want certain facts from an actor's career to use in the solution of scholarly problems—that my biographical summaries will be found inadequate as I have found the summaries of others, and that the evidence must be given in detail so that it can be easily extracted for use on any problem, and not left embedded in my interpretation of it. I have therefore written only the briefest possible comments or interpretations, but for each actor I have quoted every scrap of biographical evidence (except for the careers of English actors in Germany) in chronological order. In the case of the men acting before as well as after 1616, I have summarized the entire career but listed the facts only after 1616, or those before that date which have not been previously published. In the case of a few men who lived after 1616 but whose later theatrical activities were not their primary interest (men like Edward Alleyn) I have reduced the number of facts listed. In a few instances I have included actors for whom there are

no records after 1616, but whose theatrical activities may well have continued into the later period.

The appendices include a discussion of the various plague closings in the period and certain contemporary documents which have been referred to so frequently in the body of the book that it was desirable to make them readily accessible. Some of these documents have been printed before; others appear here for the first time.

The 'thanks to my wife' with which prefaces traditionally conclude would, in this case, be an impertinence easily recognized by the attendants in all the libraries and archives in which our research has been done. These volumes are really a collaboration in which G. E. Bentley is responsible for most of the ideas and all the mistakes and E. G. F. Bentley for half the solid work. The only pertinent thanks I can offer her are for her tolerance and her sense of humour. Fortunately for me, she has no part in this preface.

I *can* offer my gratitude to a number of institutions whose hospitality I have enjoyed and to individuals whose kindness and learning have contributed to these volumes. To the trustees of the Henry E. Huntington Library, who made me a Research Fellow for the year 1938-9 and enabled me to spend a year of uninterrupted work on my third volume, I am deeply indebted. To the staff of the Huntington I am bound not as a reader to librarians, but as a scholar to colleagues and friends. They have made of Mr. Huntington's magnificent collection a paradise for the Renaissance scholar. My debt to British libraries and archives and their custodians is, of course, very great. Many profitable months at the British Museum, the Public Record Office, Somerset House, the Guildhall Library, and the Bodleian have been made pleasant as well as profitable by the almost invariable kindness of librarians and assistants. Even in the parish churches, where I was certainly an inconvenient intruder, I have been treated with Christian tolerance. Especially I want to record my admiration and respect for the staff of the Clarendon Press, whose high standards have never wavered, and whose patience with me has never failed, while around them the normal and taken-for-granted part of life was disappearing.

To the individual scholars who have pitied and ministered to my ignorance, I confess the deepest obligations: to Professor Harold Hillebrand, to the late John Manly, to Professor Allardyce Nicoll, who initiated me into a scholar's

London and who first suggested this project, to the late Charles Read Baskervill, who read my manuscript in a crude and incomplete form, to Dr. W. W. Greg, who first was very kind to a total stranger and who later generously sent me proofs of a forthcoming Malone Society volume, to Professor W. J. Lawrence, who sent me a series of notes on the actors, to Mr. Arundel Esdaille, who examined a rare volume for me when I could not get to the British Museum, to Sir Edmund Chambers, who read the completed bulky manuscript and who made helpful suggestions, to Professor J. Q. Adams, who examined one of the Folger folios for me and who, with great generosity, allowed me to use a unique Folger manuscript which had been intended for reproduction in a special volume of 'The Folger Shakespeare Library Publications'. As the lights of civilization go out one by one, there is a melancholy pleasure in recalling these tokens of man's humanity to man.

G. E. B.

CHICAGO,
June and December, 1940

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES	xi
I. THE KING'S COMPANY I	
Actor Lists	70
Livery Allowances	90
Provincial Notices	92
Plays at Court	94
Sir Henry Herbert's Licences	101
Chronological Chart of Herbert's Licences	102
Repertory	108
II. THE PALSgrave's OR KING OF BOHEMIA'S COM- PANY 135	
Actor Lists	155
Provincial Notices	156
Repertory	156
III. QUEEN ANNE'S COMPANY—PLAYERS OF THE REVELS 158	
Actor Lists	171
Provincial Notices	172
Plays at Court	173
Repertory	174
IV. LADY ELIZABETH'S (QUEEN OF BOHEMIA'S) COM- PANY 176	
Actor Lists	192
Provincial Notices	193
Plays at Court	194
Repertory	194
V. PRINCE CHARLES'S (I) COMPANY 198	
Actor Lists	211
Provincial Notices	212
Plays at Court	213
Repertory	214
VI. QUEEN HENRIETTA'S COMPANY 218	
Actor Lists	246
Livery Allowances	247
Provincial Notices	248
Plays at Court	249
Repertory	250

VII. THE KING AND QUEEN OF BOHEMIA'S COMPANY .	260
VIII. THE RED BULL-KING'S COMPANY	270
Actor Lists	281
Provincial Notices	282
Repertory	282
IX. THE KING'S REVELS COMPANY	283
Actor Lists	297
Provincial Notices	298
Plays at Court	299
Repertory	300
X. PRINCE CHARLES'S (II) COMPANY	302
Actor Lists	321
Provincial Notices	322
Plays at Court	322
Repertory	322
XI. THE KING AND QUEEN'S YOUNG COMPANY (BEE-STON'S BOYS)	324
Actor Lists	336
Plays at Court	336
Repertory	337

VOLUME II

PLAYERS	343
APPENDIX	630
Wills	631
The Closing of the Theatres because of Plague	652
The Records of Sir Humphrey Mildmay	673
Markham's Suit	682
Heton's Papers	684
Theatrical Notes from Crosfield's Diary	688
Miscellaneous	690
INDEX	697

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES

IN a book of this sort, which deals at least as much with social and economic history as with literature, a list of all authorities consulted seems to me sheer pedantry. Most of the books I have examined, especially those consulted for material on the actors, contained nothing whatever of use for this study; a full list of them would be simply a parade of my tribulations or perhaps of my *naïveté*. I see no reason why either should be exhibited.

The list is not a bibliography of all works useful for a study of the Jacobean and Caroline theatre. I have included, for instance, only those modern editions of old plays whose introductions or notes have furnished relevant material, or editions which I have consulted when the original editions were inaccessible. Early quartos are cited in the body of the book under easily recognizable titles which may be expanded from Greg's *Handlist*.

The following list, therefore, does not pretend to be a full-dress bibliography, but includes only those authorities which have been cited in the notes in an abbreviated form and which may, accordingly, be assumed to have contributed directly to this work.

Acts P.C.—*Acts of the Privy Council of England* (1613–26), vols. 1–8 (London, 1921–34).

Adams—Joseph Quincy Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses* (Boston, 1917).

Advance Sheets—C. W. Wallace, *Advance Sheets from Shakespeare, the Globe, and Blackfriars* (Privately Printed, 1909)

Allhallows—Edward Basil Jupp and R. Hovenden, *The Registers Christenings, Marriages, and Burials of the Parish of Allhallows, London Wall* (London, 1878).

Andrews, Brome—Clarence Edward Andrews, *Richard Brome A Study of His Life and Works*, Yale Studies in English, xlv (New York, 1913).

Annals of the French Stage—Frederick William Hawkins, *Annals of the French Stage from its Origin to the Death of Racine* (London, 1884).

Arber—Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A.D.*, 5 vols. (London, 1875–94).

Aubrey, *Brief Lives*—Andrew Clark, ed., *'Brief Lives', chiefly of Contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the Years 1669 & 1696*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1898).

B.C.E.D.—See Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*

Baldon, *Lincoln's Inn*—William Paley Baldon, *Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn, The Black Books*, 4 vols. (London, 1897-1902).

Baker, *Theatrum*—Sir Richard Baker, *Theatrum Redivivum, or the Theatre Vindicated by Sir Richard Baker in Answer to Mr Pryns Histro-Mastix &c* (London, 1662).

Bald—R. C. Bald, ed., *A Game at Chesse*, by Thomas Middleton (Cambridge, 1929).

Bald, *Hengist, King of Kent*—R. C. Bald, ed., *Hengist, King of Kent, or The Mayor of Queenborough*, Folger Shakespeare Library Publications (New York, 1938).

Baldwin, *Organization*—Thomas Whitfield Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (Princeton, 1927).

Barnard, *New Links*—E. A. B. Barnard, *New Links with Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1930).

Baskervill, *Jig*—Charles Read Baskervill, *The Elizabethan Jig and Related Song Drama* (Chicago, 1929).

Bell—John Bell, *London's Remembrancer* (London, 1665).

Ben Jonson—C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, eds., *Ben Jonson*, 6 vols [in progress] (Oxford, 1925-).

Bentley, *R.E.S.*—Gerald Eades Bentley, 'Players in the Parish of St. Giles in the Fields', *The Review of English Studies*, vi (1930), 149-66.

Bentley, *T.L.S.*—G. E. Bentley, 'Shakespeare's Fellows', *Times Literary Supplement*, 15 November 1928, p. 856

Birch, *Charles I*—R. F. Williams, ed. (from the collections of Thomas Birch), *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, 2 vols. (London, 1848).

Birch, *James I*—R. F. Williams, ed. (from the collections of Thomas Birch), *The Court and Times of James the First*, 2 vols (London, 1849).

Bliss, *Inconstant Lady*—[Philip Bliss, ed.], Arthur Wilson, *The Inconstant Lady* (Oxford, 1814).

Boas—Frederick S. Boas, *Shakespeare & the Universities; and Other Studies in Elizabethan Drama* (Oxford, 1923).

Bod.—Bodleian MS. 29,445. Rough extracts made by Collier and Cunningham from London parish registers and elsewhere and entitled: 'Old Actors. Collections for the Biography of, derived from Old Books & MSS. Alphabetically arranged.'

Boswell, 'Cartwright'—Eleanore Boswell, "'Young Mr. Cartwright'", *Modern Language Review*, xxiv (1929), 125-42

Brinkley—Roberta Florence Brinkley, *Nathan Field, the Actor-Playwright*, Yale Studies in English (New Haven, 1928).

Bullen, *Old Plays*—A. H. Bullen, ed., *Old English Plays*, New Series, 3 vols. (London, 1887-90).

Burney, *Music*—Charles Burney, *A General History of Music*, Frank Mercer, ed., 2 vols. (London, 1935).

- C.S.P., *Dom.*—*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I (1547-1625)*, 12 vols., edited by Robert Lemon and M. A. E. Green (London, 1856-72).
- C.S.P., *Dom*—*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I (1625-49)*, 23 vols., edited by John Bruce, W. D. Hamilton, and Mrs. S. C. Lomas (London, 1858-97).
- C.S.P., *Ven.*—*Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy (1202-1668)*, 35 vols. [in progress], edited by Rawdon Brown, G. C. Bentinck, H. F. Brown, and A. B. Hinds (London, 1864-1935).
- Cavalier Drama*—Alfred Harbage, *Cavalier Drama An Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage* (New York, 1936).
- Challen, *Marriages*—C. W. Challen, MS. Transcript of Marriages, 1558-1786, Guildhall Library, London.
- Chalmers, *Apology*—George Chalmers, *An Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* (London, 1797).
- Chambers, *E.S*—E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1923).
- Chambers, *Shakespeare*—E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1930).
- Chi.—The University of Chicago Libraries.
- Clark, *Heywood*—Arthur Melville Clark, *Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist* (Oxford, 1931).
- Clode, *Merchant Taylors*—Charles M. Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, 2 vols. (London, 1888-9).
- Cohn, *Sh. in Ger.*—Albert Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1865).
- Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*—John Payne Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn, Founder of Dulwich College* (London: Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1841).
- Crosfield's *Diary*—Frederick S. Boas, *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield, M.A., B.D., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford* (London, 1935).
- Cunningham, *Revels*—Peter Cunningham, *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court, in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I* (London. Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1842).
- D.N.B.—*Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Dasent, *Acts P.C.*—John Roche Dasent, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England (1542-1604)*, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907).
- Davies, *Dramatic Miscellanies*—Thomas Davies, *Dramatic Miscellanies: Consisting of Critical Observations on Several Plays of Shakespeare: with a Review of His Principal Characters, and Those of Various Eminent Writers, as Represented by Mr. Garrick, and Other Celebrated Comedians. With Anecdotes of Dramatic Poets, Actors, &c.* (London, 1784).
- Denkinger—Emma Marshall Denkinger, 'Actors' Names in the Registers of St. Bodolph Aldgate', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xli (1926).

- Designs*—Percy Simpson and C. F. Bell, eds., *Designs by Inigo Jones for Masques & Plays at Court* (Oxford. Printed for the Walpole and Malone Societies, 1924).
- Diary of Lady Anne Clifford*—V. Sackville-West, *The Diary of Lady Anne Clifford* (London, 1924).
- Dibdin, *Annals*—James C. Dibdin, *The Annals of the Edinburgh Stage* (Edinburgh, 1888).
- Dictionary of Printers*—R. B. McKerrow, gen. ed., *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*, by H. G. Aldis, Robert Bowes, E. R. McC. Dix, E. Gordon Duff, Strickland Gibson, G. J. Gray, R. B. McKerrow, Falconer Madan, and H. R. Plomer (London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society, 1910).
- Dodsley—Robert Dodsley, ed., *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*. John Payne Collier, ed. 3rd ed., 12 vols. (London, 1825-7).
- Downes—Joseph Knight, ed., *Roscius Anglicanus, or, an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660 to 1706*. By John Downes (1708) (London, 1886).
- Dyce, *Beaumont and Fletcher*—Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of Beaumont & Fletcher*, 11 vols. (London, 1843-6).
- Dyce, *Shirley*—Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley*, 6 vols. (London, 1833).
- Dyce, *Works of Middleton*—Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 5 vols. (London, 1840).
- Edmond Ironside—Eleanore Boswell, ed., *Edmond Ironside; or, War Hath Made All Friends* (London: Printed for the Malone Society, 1928).
- Elson, *Wits*—John James Elson, ed., *The Wits, or, Sport upon Sport* (Ithaca Cornell University Press, 1932).
- Facetae*—*Facetae Musarum deliciae or, The Muses Recreation*. Containing severall pieces of poetique wit By Sr J. M. and Ja: S. 1656. And Wit restor'd, in severall select poems, not formerly publish't. 1658. Also Wits recreations, selected from the finest fancies of moderne muses. With a thousand out-landish proverbs. Printed from edition 1640, with all the wood engravings, and improvements of subsequent editions. To which are now added Memoirs of Sir John Mennes and Dr. James Smith (London, 1817).
- Feuillerat—Albert Feuillerat, *Le bureau des menus-plaisirs et la mise en scene à la cour d'Elizabeth* (Louvain, 1910).
- Feuillerat, *The Swisser*—Albert Feuillerat, ed., Arthur Wilson, *The Swisser* (Paris, 1904).
- Fleay, *Biog Chron.*—Frederick Gard Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1891).
- Fleay, *Stage*—Frederick Gard Fleay, *A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642* (London, 1890).
- Foedera*—Thomas Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, litterae, et cujus-cunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes, vel communitates*, 2nd ed., 20 vols (London, 1726-35).

- Folger MS.—MS. 2068 8 in the Folger Shakespeare Library, 'Playes for the Kinge this present yeare of or Lord God. 1630.'
- Frijlneck, *Barnavelt*—Wilhelmina P. Frijlneck, ed., *The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt* (Amsterdam, 1922).
- Ft. Rev.*—*The Fortnightly Review* [in progress] (London, 1865—).
- Gardiner—Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, 10 vols. (London, 1883-4).
- Genest—John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, 10 vols. (Bath, 1832).
- Gildersleeve, *Regulation*—Virginia Crocheron Gildersleeve, *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*, Columbia University Studies in English (New York, 1908).
- Gildon, *Life of Betterton*—Charles Gildon, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* (London, 1710).
- Goffin, *William Cartwright*—R. Cullis Goffin, ed., *The Life and Poems of William Cartwright* (Cambridge, 1918).
- Graunt—John Graunt, *Natural and Political Observations Mentioned in a Following Index, and Made upon the Bills of Mortality*, 5th ed. (London, 1676).
- Greg, *Dram. Doc.*—W. W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1931).
- Greg, *Handlist*—W. W. Greg, *A List of English Plays Written before 1643 and Printed before 1700* (London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society, 1900, for 1899).
- H.E.D.P.—John Payne Collier, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare: and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (London, 1879).
- Halliwell(-Phillipps), *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*—J. O. Halliwell(-Phillipps), ed., *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the Reigns of James I and Charles I*, 2 vols. (London, 1845).
- Halliwell-Phillipps, *Collection*—J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *A Collection of Ancient Documents Respecting the Office of Master of the Revels, and Other Papers Relating to the Early English Theatre, from the Original Manuscripts Formerly in the Haslewood Collection* (London: Privately Printed [11 copies], 1870).
- Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations*—J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare* (London, 1874).
- Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*—J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, 7th ed., 2 vols. (London, 1887).
- Harbage, *Davenant*—Alfred Harbage, *Sir William Davenant, Poet Venturer, 1606-1668* (Philadelphia, 1935).
- Harbage, *Killgrew*—Alfred Harbage, *Thomas Killgrew, Cavalier Dramatist, 1612-83* (Philadelphia, 1930).
- Harl. Soc. Pub.—The Publications of the Harleian Society, 64 vols. [in progress] (London, 1877—).
- Hazlitt, *Drama and Stage*—William Carew Hazlitt, ed., *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes, 1543-1664* (London: Printed for the Roxburghe Library, 1869).

- Hazlitt, *Handbook*—William Carew Hazlitt, *Handbook to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain* (London, 1867).
- Hemminge's *Elegy*—G. C. Moore Smith, *William Hemminge's Elegy on Randolph's Finger* (Oxford, 1923).
- Hens. D.—W. W. Greg, ed., *Henslowe's Diary*, 2 vols. (London, 1904-8).
- Hens. Paps.—W. W. Greg, ed., *Henslowe Papers* (London, 1907).
- Herbert—Joseph Quincy Adams, ed., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (New Haven, 1917).
- Herz, *Englische Schauspieler*—E. Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland, Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen*, xviii (Hamburg, 1903).
- Hillebrand—Harold Newcomb Hillebrand, *The Child Actors*, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xi, Nos. 1-2 (Urbana, 1926).
- 'Hill's MS. Plays'—Joseph Quincy Adams, 'Hill's List of Early Plays in Manuscript', *The Library*, New Series (June 1939), xx, 71-99.
- Hist. Hist.—James Wright, *Historia Histrionica* (1699) in Dodsley's *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*, 4th ed., W. C. Hazlitt, ed. (London, 1874-6), xv 399 ff.
- Hist. MSS. Com.—*The Historical Manuscripts Commission* [Reports, Calendars, &c.], 191 vols. (London, 1870-1936).
- Histrionastix—William Prynne, *Histrionastix. The Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragœdie* (London, 1633).
- Hotson—Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928).
- Johnson, *The History of the Drapers*—A. H. Johnson, *The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1914-22).
- Jonson Allusion-Book—Jesse Franklin Bradley and Joseph Quincy Adams, eds, *The Jonson Allusion-Book* (New Haven, 1922).
- Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes—Wallace Notestein, ed., *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (New Haven, 1923).
- King's Music—Henry Cart De Lafontaine, *The King's Music. A Transcript of Records Relating to Music and Musicians* (1460-1700) (London, 1909).
- L. C.—Lord Chamberlain.
- Laing—David Laing, *Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (London: Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1842).
- Langbaine—Gerard Langbaine and Charles Gildon, *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets* (London, 1699).
- Law, *Forgeries*—Ernest Law, *More about Shakespeare 'Forgeries'* (London, 1913).
- Lawrence, 'John Kirke'—W. J. Lawrence, 'John Kirke, the Caroline Actor-Dramatist', *Studies in Philology*, xxi, 586-93.
- Lawrence, T.L.S.—'New Facts from Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book', T.L.S., 29 November 1923, p. 820.
- Londinium Redivivum—James Peller Malcolm, *Londinium Redivivum*, 4 vols. (London, 1802-7).

- London, 1638*—T. C. Dale, *The Inhabitants of London in 1638*, 2 vols. (London: Published by the Society of Genealogists, 1931).
- Lowe, *Betterton*—Robert W. Lowe, *Thomas Betterton* (London, 1891).
- M.L.N.*—*Modern Language Notes* [in progress] (Baltimore, 1886-).
- M.L.R.*—*Modern Language Review* [in progress] (Cambridge, 1905-).
- M.S.C.*—*Malone Society Collections* (London: Printed for the Malone Society, 1907-31).
- Maas, *Theatertruppen*—Herman Maas, *Aussere Geschichte der englischen Theatertruppen in dem Zeitraum von 1559 bis 1642, Materialien zur Kunde des alteren englischen Dramas* (Louvain, 1907).
- Maidment and Logan, *D'Avenant*—James Maidment and W. H. Logan, eds., *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh, 1872-4).
- Marcham, *Revels*—Frank Marcham, *The King's Office of the Revels, 1610-1622* (London, 1925).
- Marriages, London*—Joseph Lemuel Chester, *Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Bishop of London, 1520 to 1828*, Harleian Society Publications, 2 vols. (London, 1887).
- Materialien*—*Materialien zur Kunde des alteren englischen Dramas*, Begründet und herausgegeben von W. Bang, 43 vols. (Louvain, 1902-14).
- Meissner, *Englischen Comoedianten*—Johannes Meissner, *Die englischen Comoedianten zur Zeit Shakespeares in Oesterreich* (Wien, 1884).
- Mem. Act*—John Payne Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare* (London: Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1846).
- Middx. Co. Rec*—John Cordy Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records* (London: Published by the Middlesex County Records Society, 1886-92), vol. iii (1888).
- Middx. Sessions*—William Le Hardy, ed., *Middlesex Sessions Records*, 1612- [in progress], New Series (London, 1935-).
- Mod. Phil.*—*Modern Philology* [in progress] (Chicago, 1903-).
- MSS. Dul.*—G. F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts and Mummings of Alleyn's College of God's Gift at Dulwich* (London, 1881).
- Murray—John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies 1558-1642*, 2 vols. (London, 1910).
- N. & Q.*—*Notes and Queries* [in progress] (London, 1850-).
- N.S.S. Pub.*—*New Shakspeare Society Publications*, 41 vols. (London, 1874-1904).
- N.S.S. Trans.*—*New Shakspeare Society Transactions*, 14 vols. (London, 1874-1904).
- Nason, *Shirley*—Arthur Huntington Nason, *James Shirley, Dramatist* (New York: Privately Printed, 1915).
- Neb. Univ. Stud.*—*Nebraska University Studies* [in progress] (Lincoln, 1888-).
- Nethercot, *D'Avenant*—Arthur H. Nethercot, *Sir William D'Avenant, Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938).

- Nichols, *Progresses of James I*—John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court*, 4 vols. (London, 1828).
- Nicoll—Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama 1660-1700*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1928).
- Nicoll, *Dev. of the Theater*—Allardyce Nicoll, *The Development of the Theater* (London, 1927).
- Nungezer—Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors and of Other Persons Associated with the Public Representation of Plays in England before 1642*, Cornell Studies in English (New Haven, 1929).
- Oliphant—E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927).
- P.R.O.—Public Record Office.
- Parrott, *Chapman Tragedies*—Thomas Marc Parrott, *Chapman's Tragedies*, vol. i of *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman*, 3 vols. (London, 1910-14).
- Parton, *St Giles*—John Parton, *Some Account of the Hospital and Parish of St Giles in the Fields, Middlesex* (London, 1822).
- Pepysian Garland*—Hyder E. Rollins, ed., *A Pepysian Garland* (Cambridge, 1922).
- Phil. Quart*—*Philological Quarterly* [in progress] (Iowa City, 1922-).
- Plays and Masques*—Mary Susan Steele, *Plays & Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles*, Cornell Studies in English (New Haven, 1926).
- Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*—William J. Lawrence, *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (Cambridge, 1927).
- R.É.S.*—*The Review of English Studies* [in progress] (London, 1925-).
- Remembrancia*—*Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia*. Preserved among the Archives of the City of London. A.D. 1579-1664 (London, 1878).
- Rimbault, *Chapel Royal*—Edward F. Rimbault, *The Old Cheque-Book, or, Book of Remembrance, of the Chapel Royal, from 1561-1744* (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1872).
- Rollins, 'Commonwealth Drama'—Hyder E. Rollins, 'A Contribution to the History of the English Commonwealth Drama', *Studies in Philology*, xviii (1921), 267-333.
- S.R.—Stationers' Register.
- Sh. Jahr.*—*Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft* (Berlin, 1865-1925).
- Sh. Soc. Paps.*—*The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, 4 vols. (Publications of the Shakespeare Society) (London, 1844-9).
- Shakspeareana Genealogica*—George Russell French, *Shakspeareana Genealogica* (London, 1869).
- Sibley, *Lost Plays*—Gertrude Marian Sibley, *The Lost Plays and Masques, 1500-1642* (Ithaca, 1933).
- Sisson, *B.A.Y.L.*—Charles J. Sisson, ed., *Believe as You List by Philip Massinger, 1631*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford, 1927 [1928]).

- Sisson, *Keep the Widow Waking*—Charles Sisson, 'Keep the Widow Waking' A Lost Play by Dekker', *The Library*, viii (1927-8), 39-57, 233-59.
- Sisson, *Lost Plays*—C. J. Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* (Cambridge, 1936).
- Smith, *Sir Henry Wotton*—Logan Pearsall Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1907).
- Soddered Citizen*—John Henry Pyle Pafford, ed., *The Soddered Citizen*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford, 1935 [1936]).
- St. Ann B.—The Parish Registers of St. Ann's Blackfriars, London (unpublished).
- St. B.B.—A. W. C. Hallen, ed., *The Registers of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London*, 3 vols. (London, 1889-95).
- St. G.C.—The Parish Registers of St. Giles' Cripplegate, London (unpublished).
- St. G.F.—The Parish Registers of St. Giles in the Fields, London (unpublished).
- St J.C.—R. Hovenden, ed., *A True Register of All the Christeninges, Marriages, and Burialles in the Parishes of St. James, Clarkenwell, from the Yeare : . . 1551*, Harleian Society Publications, 6 vols. (London, 1884-94).
- St. L.S.—The Parish Registers of St. Leonard's Shoreditch, London (unpublished).
- St. M A —W. Bruce Bannerman, ed., *The Registers of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, London*, Harleian Society Publications, 2 vols. (London, 1931-2).
- St. M F —J. T. Kitto, ed., *The Register of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, 1619-1636*, Harleian Society Publications (London, 1936).
- St. S.S.—The Parish Registers of St. Saviour's, Southwark, London (unpublished).
- St. T —The Parish Registers of St. Thomas' Southwark (unpublished).
- 'Stage Gleanings'—E. K. Chambers, 'Elizabethan Stage Gleanings', *The Review of English Studies*, 1 (1925), 75-8, 182-6.
- Stopes, *Burbage*—Mrs. C. C. Stopes, *Burbage and Shakespeare's Stage* (London, 1913).
- Stork, *Rowley*—Charles Wharton Stork, *William Rowley, His All's Lost by Lust, and A Shoemaker, a Gentleman* (Philadelphia, 1910).
- Stow—John Stow, *Annales, or A Generall Chronicle of England* (continued by Edmund Howes) (London, 1631).
- Strafforde's Letters*—William Knowler, ed., *The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Dispatches, with an Essay towards His Life, by Sir George Radcliffe*, 2 vols. (London, 1739).
- Stud. Phil.*—*Studies in Philology* [in progress] (Chapel Hill, 1906-).
- Sup. Ap.*—George Chalmers, *A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* (London, 1799).
- Surrey*—R. Rawlinson, ed., *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, Begun in the Year 1673, by John Aubrey . . . and Continued to the Present Time* (London, 1718-19).
- Symonds, 'Diary'—E. M. Symonds, 'The Diary of John Greene

- (1635-59)', *English Historical Review*, xliii (1928), 385-94, 598-604, xliii (1929), 106-17
- Taylor, *Complete Works*—John Taylor, *All the Workes of Iohn Taylo: The Water-Poet* (London, 1630)
- Thorndike—Ashley H. Thorndike, *Shakespeare's Theater*, 2nd ed (New York, 1928).
- Thorn-Drury, *Randolph*—George Thorn-Drury, ed, *The Poems of Thomas Randolph* (London, 1929)
- T.L.S.—*The Times Literary Supplement* [in progress] (London, 1902-).
- Variorum*—James Boswell, ed, *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, with the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators: Comprehending a Life of the Poet, and an Enlarged History of the Stage, by the Late Edmond Malone*, 21 vols. (London, 1821). [Vol. iii also contains Chalmers's *Farther Account . . . of the English Stage*]
- Waldron, *Sh. Miscellany*—Francis Godolphin Waldron, *Free Reflections on Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments, Under the Hand and Seal of William Shakspeare, in the Possession of Samuel Ireland. . . To which are added, Extracts from an Unpublished MS Play, Called the Virgin Queen* (London, 1796).
- Wallace, *Sh. and Lond. Assoc*—C. W. Wallace, *Shakespeare and His London Associates . . .*, Nebraska University Studies, vol. x, No. 4 (1910).
- Wallace, *Three Theatres*—C. W. Wallace, *Three London Theatres of Shakespeare's Time*, Nebraska University Studies, vol. ix, No. 4 (1909).
- Whimzies*—Clitus Alexandrinus [Richard Brathwaite], *Whimzies. Or, A New Cast of Characters* (London, 1631).
- Wilkinson, *Lovelace*—C. H. Wilkinson, ed, *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1925).
- Williams, *English Journalism*—J. B. Williams, *A History of English Journalism* (London, 1908).
- Wilson, 'Crane'—F. P. Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, Fourth Series (1927), vii 194-215.
- Wilson, *Plague*—F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (Oxford, 1927).
- Wilson, 'The Task of Heminge and Condell'—J. Dover Wilson, 'The Task of Heminge and Condell', *Studies in the First Folio Written for the Shakespeare Association in Celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary* (London, 1924).
- Winter, *Staple of News*—De Winter, ed., *The Staple of News by Ben Jonson* (New York, 1905).
- Wood, *Hist. & Antiq. Oxon.*—Anthony à Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, John Gutch, trans., 2 vols. in 3 (Oxford, 1792-6).
- Wood's *Athenae*—Philip Bliss, ed., Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 4 vols. (London, 1813-20).
- Young—William Young, *The History of Dulwich College*, 2 vols. (London, 1889).

CHAPTER I

THE KING'S COMPANY

(FORMERLY THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S COMPANY)

Records of a company of Lord Hunsdon's players (Hunsdon became Lord Chamberlain in 1585) are found in the provinces from 1564, and the company acted at court in 1582 and 1586. Because no records of a Lord Chamberlain's company appear from 1590 to 1594, Sir Edmund Chambers thinks it improbable that there was any continuity between the early company or companies and Shakespeare's troupe, which seems to have been formed chiefly from the old Lord Strange's men.

This new Lord Chamberlain's company appears in Henslowe's records as acting with the Admiral's men at Newington Butts in June 1594. Later in the year the Lord Chamberlain's men were established at the Cross Keys, and from this time on they continued to appear as a leading London company. They were paid for five plays at court in the Christmas season of 1595-6 and for six in 1596-7. Probably their summer performances were given at the Theatre, for Richard Burbage was a leading member of the company by 1594.

When their patron died, 22 July 1596, the company was retained by his son and was thus known as Lord Hunsdon's men until the second Lord Hunsdon was appointed Lord Chamberlain 17 March 1596/7. The restraint of playing brought about by *The Isle of Dogs* forced them to travel during the summer and early autumn of 1597. Perhaps on their return to town they acted at the Curtain instead of the Theatre. They played at court during the Christmas festivities of 1597-8. In this winter the Privy Council restricted the number of London companies to two, the Lord Chamberlain's and the Admiral's, thus setting up a direct competition which seems to have led to disputes. The earliest list of the company, one affixed to the 1616 folio text of *Every Man in His Humour*, refers to this time, it names Will Shakespeare, Aug. Philips, Hen. Condell, Will. Slye, Will. Kempe, Ric. Burbage, Joh. Hemings, Tho. Pope, Chr. Beeston, and Joh. Duke. For Shakespeare's plays, which formed a most conspicuous part of the repertory of the company at this time, we have no casts.

In the winter of 1598-9 the Globe was erected in Southwark, and the interest in the new theatre was divided, half to Richard and Cuthbert Burbage and half to Shakespeare, Pope, Phillips, Heminges, and Kempe. Heminges, a leader and payee of the company for many years, was paid for plays given by the Lord Chamberlain's men at court in 1599-1600 and 1600-1. In February 1600/1 they were persuaded to present *Richard II* as a prelude to the Essex rebellion. Their part appears to have been unwitting, and it is not known that they were punished. They gave performances at court during the Christmas season of 1601-2 and their last performance before Elizabeth in 1602-3.

Upon the death of the Queen, all playing ceased, and when the company began to perform again it was as the King's men, for they had received a new patent 19 May 1603. This patent names Lawrence Fletcher, William Shakespeare, Richard Burbage, Augustyne Philipps, John Heninges, Henrie Condell, William Sly, Robert Armin, and Richard Cowly. The company travelled in 1602 and 1603 and returned to court for the Christmas performances of the latter year. They were at Oxford in the early summer of 1604, attended the Spanish ambassador as Grooms of the Chamber in August, and gave a long series of plays at court at Christmas time. The Christmas seasons of 1605-6, 1606-7, and 1607-8 found the company again conspicuous in the list of court entertainers.

In the summer of 1608 the company took over the lease of the Blackfriars theatre and apparently some of the actors of the Children of the Revels, though it appears that the King's men did not come into actual possession of the theatre until the autumn of 1609. The new lease was made out to Cuthbert Burbage and Thomas Evans and five King's men—Richard Burbage, William Shakespeare, John Heminges, Henry Condell, and William Sly. During the plague closing of July 1608 to December 1609 they travelled, though they appeared at court for the Christmas seasons of 1608 and 1609 and were given additional rewards because of their difficulties. Plays were given at court in 1610-11, 1611-12, and 1612-13, in the last two years the number of plays given was twenty-two and twenty respectively. The plays selected for these court performances were chiefly those of Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Jonson. During a performance of *Henry VIII* on 29 June 1613 the Globe was burned. A levy was immediately made upon the housekeepers in order to rebuild, and the new theatre was completed before 30 June 1614. The company performed at court again in 1613-14, 1614-15, and 1615-16.

It requires only a glance at the bulk of the material concerning this company to see how the King's men overshadowed all other Jacobean and Caroline players. Our fuller knowledge about the earlier years of their existence is due largely to Shakespearian researches, and a part of our knowledge of the later period comes from the same source, but Shakespearian researches account for only part of our large store of information about the King's men. In Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books, on the title-pages of extant plays, and in contemporary reference, the King's company appears far more frequently than any other. It is the only London company which has a continuous existence throughout our period, and of course it was already one of the oldest London troupes at the time of Shakespeare's death.

In 1616 the organization appears to have consisted of

twelve members¹ and various hired men, musicians, and apprentices. The twelve members were those later listed in the patent of 1619, except that in 1616 Richard Robinson had not yet succeeded Richard Cowley.² John Heminges was still the leader, or at least the treasurer, though he had ceased to appear on the stage by 1612.³ Invariably he received payment for plays at court,⁴ he stood first in all official lists of the company, and at times he even acted as representative of all the London companies.⁵

For several years the King's men had been playing during the summer months at the Globe on the Bankside, a large new theatre less than two years old at the time of Shakespeare's death and, according to John Chamberlain, reputed to be 'the fairest that ever was in England'.⁶ During the rest of the year the company performed at their private house in Blackfriars.⁷ Both these theatres were held in joint tenancy by the actors themselves. The site of the Globe was leased, and the ownership of the building was vested half in Richard and Cuthbert Burbage and half in certain of the players who

¹ The number named in both the patent of 1619 and the livery list of that year

² See list below, p. 72, and Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 50-1

³ See 'Players'.

⁴ See below, pp. 94-6.

⁵ *Herbert*, p. 48.

⁶ Birch, *James I.*, 1. 329.

⁷ It might have been guessed from the nature of the two theatres that the company would divide its time between them in this way, but Malone established this supposition as a fact from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book. 'As the Globe was partly exposed to the weather, and they acted there usually by day-light, it appeared to me probable (when this essay was originally published) that this was the summer theatre, and I have lately found my conjecture confirmed by Sir Henry Herbert's Manuscript. The king's company usually began to play at the Globe in the month of May' (*Herbert*, p. 67).

Malone's statement about the company's usual time of transfer from the Blackfriars to the Globe is confirmed by Sir Humphrey Mildmay's records of his visits to the theatre (see Appendix, pp. 673 ff.). In his diary there are thirteen records of plays at the Blackfriars and four at the Globe. Sir Humphrey never mentions the Blackfriars in June, July, August, or September—though he never mentions any play-going before 1643 in August or September, since he usually stayed in the country during those months. Performances in May were sometimes at the Blackfriars and sometimes at the Globe—at Blackfriars on 6 May 1635, 15 May 1640, and 19 May 1641, and at the Globe on 16 May 1633 and 23 May 1633.

I know of no evidence as to the usual date of the transfer from the Globe back to the Blackfriars, but I should surmise that it would be about Michaelmas, when the lawyers, well known as patrons of the Blackfriars and the Cockpit, were back in town. The earliest visit to Blackfriars recorded by Sir Humphrey was on 27 October 1638, but we cannot make much of this fact, since there is no other record in the diary that he attended any theatre between the end of July and the 1st of November.

were called housekeepers.¹ The private house in Blackfriars was held similarly.²

This financial interest of the players themselves in their theatres must be considered a prominent factor in their success; its effect on the solidarity and permanence of the company is obvious. We have no evidence that any other groups were so organized.³ When other companies broke or changed houses or were reorganized, the King's men played on at the Blackfriars and the Globe.

Throughout our period there are numerous records of the King's men at court—more, of course, than for any other company. Generally the number of plays given was so large as to provide a substantial addition to the income of the players. For instance, they gave thirteen performances between 1 November 1616 and 2 February 1616/17,⁴ and during the Christmas season of the following year they gave fifteen.⁵

That the King's men were equally popular with the general public is indicated by a petition of the godly officers and inhabitants of the precinct of Blackfriars to the city authorities, about January 1618/19. This petition complains of the playhouse in Blackfriars,

vnto which there is daylie such resort of people, and such multitudes of Coaches (whereof many are Hackney Coaches, bringinge people of all sortes) That sometymes all our streetes cannott containe them, But that they Clogg vpp Ludgate alsoe, in such sort,

¹ Of course, these housekeepers were different men at different times, as shares changed hands because of death or sale. In 1599 the sharers of the second moiety were Shakespeare, Phillips, Pope, Heminges, and Kempe (see Wallace, *Sh and Lond Assoc.*, pp. 313 ff.), and in 1635 the housekeepers of the Globe were Shank, Taylor, Lowin, Cuthbert Burbage, the widow of Richard Burbage, and the widow of Henry Condell (see below, pp. 43 ff.). I have not thought it necessary in this chapter to discuss the history of theatre shares. See Chambers, *E.S.* ii, chap. xvi, J. Q. Adams, 'The Housekeepers of the Globe', *Mod. Phil.* xvii. 1-8; and Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 90-111.

² The shares of the Blackfriars were divided in 1608 into seven equal parts assigned to Richard and Cuthbert Burbage, Heminges, Shakespeare, Condell, Sly, and Thomas Evans (see *Advance Sheets*). In 1635, after the Lord Chamberlain's readjustment on the petition of Benfield, Pollard, and Swanston, there were eight shares divided between Cuthbert Burbage, the widow of Richard Burbage, the widow of Henry Condell, Shank, Swanston, Benfield, Pollard, Lowin, Taylor, and the heirs of John Underwood. For a full discussion, see Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 111-17.

³ The Palsgrave's men appear to have tried some such arrangement in October 1618, but it was not continued after the building of the new Fortune in 1622. See below, pp. 137-44.

⁴ See below, p. 94.

⁵ *Ibid.*

that both they endanger the one the other breake downe stalles, throwe downe mens goodes from their shopps, And the inhabitants there cannott come to their howses, nor bringe in their necessary provisions of beere, wood, coale or haye, nor the Tradesmen or shopkeep[er]s vtter their wares, nor the passenger goe to the comon water staires without danger of ther lives and lymmes,¹ whereby alsoe many times, quarrelles and effusion of blood hath followed; and what further danger may bee occaſioned by the broyles plottes or practises of such an vnrule multitude of people yf they should gett head, yo^r. wisdomes cann conceave, These inconveniences fallinge out almost everie daie in the winter tyme (not forbearinge the tyme of Lent) from one or twoe of the clock till sixe att night, which beinge the tyme alsoe most vsuall for Christeninges and burials and afternoones service, wee cannot haue passage to the Church for p[er]formance of those necessary duties, the ordinary passage for a great part of the precinct aforesaid beinge close by the play house dore²

One is not surprised to see that the signatures to this document are headed by the name of William Gouge, the well-known Puritan minister of St. Anne's, Blackfriars³

As a result of the petition, the London Common Council on 21 January 1618/19 ordered that the King's men should cease to play in the Blackfriars⁴ This order evidently annoyed the players but little, for on 27 March 1619 there was issued to them a new licence by which the King gave to his 'welbeloved servants' the privilege of playing 'wthin their two their now usuall houses called the Globe wthin o^r Couñ of Surrey and their private house scituate in the p^rcincts of the Blackfriars wthin o^r City of london'.⁵ The men named in this patent are John Heminges, Richard Burbage, Henry Condell, John Lowin, Nicholas Tooley, John Underwood, Nathan Field, Robert Benfield, Robert Gough, William Ecclestone, Richard Robinson, and John Shank.⁶

¹ There is eloquent testimony in the registers of St Anne's, Blackfriars, that the parishioners were not exaggerating the danger from coaches. The MS. registers carry the following entry, dated 19 January 1637/8, among the burials 'William Jordan a Beggar kild w^t a Coach coming from the Play'

² *M.S.C.* 1. 91-2

³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁴ Hallwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, i 311

⁵ *M.S.C.* 1. 280-2 The licence is printed in the *Malone Society Collection* from the Signet Bill The editor says (p 280) 'It is not clear at first sight why the company wanted a new licence in 1619, as that of 1603, No 11, was still valid Probably the explanation lies in the specific mention of the Blackfriars as a house where they had authority to play An attempt had been made earlier in the year by the Corporation of London to suppress the house'

⁶ Professor Baldwin argues with some show of reason that Shank had succeeded Armin, Ecclestone had succeeded Cooke, Robinson had succeeded

Less than two months after the complaint of the people of Blackfriars and two weeks before the issue of the new licence came a serious reverse for the company. On 13 March 1618/19 Richard Burbage died.¹ This actor, the creator of many Shakespearian roles and the 'star' of the company, was easily the most famed player of his time. Edward Alleyn, his greatest rival, had retired from the stage several years before,² and in the last decade of his life the supremacy of Burbage was unchallenged. The universal esteem in which he was held may be seen in the elegies and epitaphs which Mrs Stopes quotes.³ The most touching notice and one which recalls the special privileges the King's men often received from the Lord Chamberlain is the often quoted letter written by the Earl of Pembroke to Viscount Doncaster in Germany, more than two months after the player's death:

. . . now you have all that I know that past since your departure but that my Lord of Lenox made a great supper to the French Embassador this night here and even now all the company are at the play, which I being tender-harted, could not endure to see so soone after the loss of my old acquaintance Burbage.⁴

Middleton said that to the people 'Dick Burbage was their mortal God on earth'.⁵ The loss of such a man must have been a sad blow to the King's players.

Probably the theatres had already been closed in mourning for Queen Anne (she had died on the 2nd of March)⁶ when Burbage died. At any rate, they were closed before 19 March, for on that day John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton at The Hague:

The funeral [of the Queen] is put off to the 29th of next month, to the great hinderance of our players, which are forbidden to play so long as her body is above ground: one special man among them, Burbage, is lately dead, and hath left, they say, better than 300*l.* in land.⁷

Cowley, Field had succeeded Shakespeare, and Benfield had succeeded Ostler (Baldwin, *Organization*, pp 50-1).

¹ Stopes, *Burbage*, p. 116. Evidently he died between the first and last stages of the patent of 1619.

² See 'Players'.

³ Stopes, *Burbage*, pp. 116-23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 117, from Egerton MS. 2592, f. 81.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Gardiner, iii 294.

⁷ *H.E.D.P.* iii. 297. The letter is given in a shortened form in *C.S.P.*,

Since the Queen's funeral did not take place until the 13th of May,¹ we must assume that the theatres were closed for some eleven weeks.

On 19 May 1619 the Earl of Pembroke signed an order for liveries for the King's company. The twelve men mentioned are the same as the twelve of the patent, except that Burbage, of course, is omitted, and Joseph Taylor has been added to the list.² Evidently Taylor had come from Prince Charles's men to fill Burbage's place.³

Later in this year, difficulties arose concerning the play of *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*. A letter of 14 August preserved among the State Papers tells us that after the piece was ready, the players 'at th' instant were prohibited by my Lo. of London'.⁴ The play must have been easily expurgated, or else 'my Lo. of London' was persuaded to change his attitude, for on 27 August the same correspondent wrote that 'Our players haue fownd the meanes to goe through wth the play of Barnevelt, and it hath had many spectators and receaued applause'.⁵ The actors who took part in this production may be found listed below.⁶

These restraints upon the activities of the players 'at th' instant' must have been one of the great trials of Jacobean theatrical management, but unexpected orders were not always so unpleasant as those of the Bishop of London. In the same year as the Bishop's prohibition, presumably four or five months later, the company was ordered to court on equally short notice. Thomas Cooke, a Groom of the Chamber to Prince Charles, presented in January 1619/20 a bill for carrying 'two Message two severall tymes from the Court at Whithaell into London by Cripellgatt, to warn M^r Ben Johnson the Poet, and the Players at the Blackfriars to atend Hys Highnes that night following at Court, wch.

Dom., 1619-23, p. 26 (No. 43). Collier points out that Middleton is probably referring to this theatre-closing in his lines on the death of Burbage.

Astronomers and star gazers this year,
Write of but four eclipses, five appear,
Death interposing Burbage, and there staying,
Hath made a visible eclipse of playing

¹ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1619-23, pp. 43-5.

² See below, p. 72.

³ See 'Players'.

⁴ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1619-23, p. 71, and *Athenaeum*, 19 January 1884, p. 89.

⁵ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1619-23, p. 73, and *Athenaeum*, loc. cit.

⁶ On p. 74. For an analysis of the prompt MS. of this play, see Frijlunck, *Barnavelt*, and Greg, *Dram. Doc.*, pp. 268-74.

severall services being done, he returned each tyme with answer. . . .¹

On 7 April 1621 a livery allowance was made to twelve King's men,² but it differs only slightly from the allowance of 1619. The name of John Rice has replaced that of Nathan Field, who had died some time before August 1620;³ otherwise the list of 1621 is the same as that of 1619.⁴

In the next few years we have records of many of the King's plays and the dates of not a few of their court performances. For several of these plays we know the casts, and for a few the parts taken by the various players.⁵ These facts are all tabulated on pages 72 ff. in a form which ought to be more useful than a running account of licences and court performances.

The most famous event of the year 1623, the appearance of 'Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories & Tragedies', is an essential part of the history of the King's company. In the universal modern acclaim of the poet Shakespeare, the significance of this volume as a document of the 'Elizabethan' theatre and in particular of the theatrical enterprise known as the King's men is usually forgotten. Yet the plays were 'collected & publish'd' by the two senior members of the company; the volume was dedicated to the nobleman who, as Lord Chamberlain, was ultimately responsible for the conduct of the players, and to his brother who succeeded him in that office; it contains, as one of its most conspicuous pieces of preliminary matter, the fullest list of the actors of the company that has come down to us; several of the addresses and memorial poems make direct reference to the actors of the plays or to their theatres; and, finally, the plays themselves, as has been pointed out, constitute 'a collection of theatrical documents of the utmost value for the light which they throw upon methods of production in the Elizabethan and Jacobean playhouse'.⁶

An event which touched the interests of the players at so many points must have loomed large in their minds as the playhouse scripts were being assembled for the publisher and,

¹ *N & Q.*, 4 March 1871, p. 183.

² *Hist MSS Com.*, Report IV, p. 299.

³ See 'Players'.

⁴ See below, p. 76.

⁵ For a thorough, though often too ambitious, analysis of the parts of the various members of the company, see Baldwin, *Organization*, chapters vii, viii, and ix and the Appendices.

⁶ Wilson, 'The Task of Heminge and Condell', p. 56

later, when they enjoyed the public attention which the largest collection of contemporary plays in print inevitably brought to the company so intimately associated with them. No document in the history of the King's company is so integral a part of, and so illuminating for, the company of the Blackfriars and the Globe as the First Folio, and that entirely apart from the greatness of the plays themselves.

Between 3 June 1623 and 17 June 1624, Nicholas Tooley, one of the older members of the company, died. His will of 3 June 1623¹ is illustrative of the intimacy of this group of players, a characteristic which made them more than a commercial company in the modern sense. The executors of the will were Henry Condell and Cuthbert Burbage, the men longest connected with the company. There is a legacy to Mrs. Cuthbert Burbage, 'as a remembrance of my love in respect of her motherlie care over me', another to Cuthbert Burbage's daughter, others to Richard Burbage's sister and his daughter, and ten pounds to Mrs. Condell. Debts are forgiven Joseph Taylor, John Underwood, and William Ecclestone, and Cuthbert Burbage and Henry Condell are made residuary legatees. Except for small legacies to four relatives and to the poor of two parishes, the entire estate is left to the King's players and their families. The relationship which prompted such last thoughts must have made the ensemble of a Globe production worthy of the plays presented.

The year 1624 was an eventful one for the King's players. Like the other companies of the time, they realized the drawing power of political satire, and the temptation to make use of it was sometimes too great for their discretion. In the last years of the reign of James the question of the Spanish marriage for Prince Charles and all its religious corollaries were much in the public eye. When Charles had returned from Spain without a Spanish bride in October 1623, the public rejoicing had known no bounds,² and in the ensuing months relations between the two countries had been drifting towards open hostilities. In June 1624 the departure of the Spanish ambassadors from England had been accompanied by various insults.³ Popular opinion about Spain was sufficiently uniform to afford an excellent opportunity for the players, but unfortunately it was not to the general public that they were answerable for their actions.

¹ See below, pp. 649-51.

² See Gardiner, v. 128-9, and Bald, pp. 3-4.

³ Gardiner, v. 244.

Thomas Middleton wrote his *Game at Chesse* at this time on the many alleged Spanish and Catholic intrigues of the day, and the play was presented by the King's men at the Globe on Friday, 6 August, though Herbert had licensed it two months before.¹ It had a prodigious success. One account says that the players took in one hundred pounds a night,² another that 'the play of Gondomar was so much frequented by all classes, that one had to be there by one o'clock to find room',³ and contemporary gossip had it that they took fifteen hundred pounds in nine days.⁴ Perhaps this contemporary gossip about the players' receipts cannot be taken too literally, but we have five references to its nine-day run,⁵ and it is evident that the success of the play was town talk.

Such a bonanza was too good to last for long. The Privy Council might choose to wink at the play on the Bankside, but one could scarcely expect the Spaniards to be so sympathetic to Middleton's ideas.⁶ The Spanish Ambassador reported the matter to James, and shortly after, on 12 August,

¹ Sir Henry Herbert licensed the play 12 June 1624, according to the MS. note by Malone in his copy of the third quarto now in the Bodleian (Wilson, 'Crane', p. 209). The date of the first performance is given in a letter from George Lowe to Sir Arthur Ingram (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, Report on MSS in Various Collections, vol. viii. The MSS of the Hon. Fredrick Lindley Wood, p. 27). For the historical background of the play, see R. C. Bald's edition, pp. 1-18, and for the documents concerning its stage history see Appendix A of the same volume.

² Sir Francis Nethersole to Carleton, *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1623-5, p. 327.

³ Chamberlain to Carleton, *ibid.*, p. 330.

⁴ Dyce, *Works of Middleton*, 1, p. xxxv, from a MS. note.

⁵ Nethersole's letter to Carleton, Chamberlain's letter to Carleton, the MS. note in the Dyce quarto, and the title-pages of the first and second quartos. See Bald, pp. 161, 164, 166, and 47.

⁶ There can be no doubt that the councillors had heard of the play. The King suspected them, since he wrote of his surprise 'that none of his own ministers, who must have heard of it, have not reported it to him' (*C.S.P., Dom.*, 1623-5, p. 325, No. 39). Chamberlain's account of the sensation makes it perfectly clear that all London knew what was going on and, incidentally, what sort of an audience was attracted to the Bankside by the piece: 'I doubt not but you have heard of our famous play of Gondemar, which hath been followed with extraordinary curiosity, and frequented by all sorts of people, old and young, rich and poor, masters and servants, papists and puritans, wise men, &c. churchmen and Scotsmen, as Sir Henry Wotton, Sir Albert Morton, Sir Benjamin Rudyard, Sir Thomas Lake, and a world besides. The Lady Smith would have gone, if she could have persuaded me to go thither. I am not so sour nor so severe, but that I would willingly have attended her, but I could not sit so long, for we must have been there before one o'clock at farthest to find any room. They counterfeited his person to the life, with all his graces and faces, and had gotten, they say, a cast suit of his apparel for the purpose, and his letter [litter], wherein the world says there lacked nothing but a couple of asses to carry

Mr. Secretary Conway was writing sharply to the Privy Council expressing the King's indignation and his command that the poet and players be examined at once and those at fault committed to prison. There were to be no half-way measures, for the Council were to

certifie his Ma^{tie} what yo^u find that comedie to bee, by whom it was made, by whom lycenced, and what course yo^u thinke fittest to bee held for the exemplarie, and severe punishment of the p^{re}sent offenders, and to restrayne such insolent and lycencious p^{re}sumption for the future.¹

On the 21st the Council replied that upon examination the players had produced the book, licensed by Sir Henry Herbert, and protested that they had added nothing in their performances. Middleton, 'shifting out of the way', could not be found, but there was a warrant out for his apprehension. The players were reprov'd, commanded to cease acting the

it, and Sir George Petre or Sir Tobie Mattheew to bear him company. But the worst is, playing him, they played somebody else, for which they are forbidden to play that, or any other play, till the king's further pleasure be known and they may be glad if they can so escape Scot free. The wonder lasted but nine days, for so long they played it' (John Chamberlain, Esq., to Sir Dudley Carleton, 21 August 1624, from Birche, *James I*, II 472-3).

Professor Dover Wilson in his review of Bald's edition of *A Game at Chesse* (*Library*, XI 105-16) goes much further than I am willing to in suggesting connivance in the production of the play. He notes the fact that Herbert licensed it and that we have no record of his punishment for so doing. These two facts suggest to him that Herbert must have 'covered himself completely by securing the approval of the Court'. I cannot say that such connivance is impossible, but it seems to me to be a very rash hypothesis. There is no evidence that Herbert was punished, but we cannot assume, therefore, that he was not. In most of the known cases of theatrical indiscretions we are ignorant of the punishments.

Professor Dover Wilson further notes the long delay between the licence of the play by Sir Henry Herbert on 12 June 1624 and its first performance at the Globe on 6 August following. He comments, 'Surely the most natural explanation is that the two months were partly taken up with private performances of the play at the instigation of the war party at Court?' Such a conjecture is entertaining, but there is no evidence whatever for it. When we consider the amount of correspondence and gossip about the public performances of the play, it is inconceivable that a series of preceding private performances at court, equally sensational, should have escaped mention.

Professor Wilson's conjectures would make the lively affair of *A Game at Chesse* even more exciting, but they are not convincing.

The suggestion of Louis B. Wright (*T.L.S.*, 16 February 1928, p. 112), based on E. C. Morris' discovery of an allegory of affairs in the Palatinate in the play (*Englische Studien*, XXXVIII [1907], 39-52), that Prince Charles and Buckingham sponsored the play as propaganda for English intervention in the Palatinate, is an interesting one. Unfortunately, however, there is no independent evidence for this hypothesis, and Bald does not accept the Palatinate allegory in the play or the probability of the Duke's sponsorship.

¹ Bald, p. 160, from *C.S.P., Dom.*, James I, vol. 171, No. 39

comedy, and to act nothing else until His Majesty's pleasure was known. Their bond for three hundred pounds was taken, and the play was sent to the King, with a suggestion that Herbert be questioned.¹ Conway replied that His Majesty had no desire to ruin the company, but that he was most anxious to punish the persons who had directed the impersonating of Gondomar. Evidently there were petitions and counter-petitions at court.¹

Another letter from Pembroke to the President of the Council reiterates this compassion for the players.

That his Ma^{ty} nowe Conceives y^e punishment if not satisfactory for all their Insolency, yet such, as since it stopps y^e Current of their poore livelyhood and maintēance without much prejudice they Cannot longer vndergo. In Comiseracion therefore of those his poore servants, his Ma^{ty} would have their LL^{ps} Connive at any Common play lycenced by authority, that they shall act as before; As for this of y^e Game at Chesse, that it bee not onely antiquated and sylenced, but y^e Players bound as formerly they weare, and in that poynt onely never to Act it agayne, Yet not withstanding that my LL proceed in their disquisiçon to fynd out y^e originall roote of this offence, whether it sprang from y^e Poet, Players, or both, and to Certefy his Ma^{ty} accordingly And so desiring yo^r Lop to take into yo^r Consideracion and then into yo^r Care.²

Evidently the King's men were restrained from acting for about ten days. If they played *A Game at Chesse* nine days beginning Friday, 6 August, they were restrained on the 17th (allowing for two Sundays). They were allowed to begin again a day or two after Pembroke's letter of 27 August directing that they be allowed to act as before.

On 30 August, indemnities were taken from Edward Middleton, the son of the poet, and here the story ends.³ Who suffered for *A Game at Chesse* we do not know. The last of the letters from the King leaves the impression that he was looking for a scapegoat to take the place of the players.

The sensational success of *A Game at Chesse* was evidently long remembered in theatrical circles. Jonson alluded to it a year and a half later in his *Staple of News*;⁴ Brome spoke of it in *The Northern Lass*;⁵ William Heminges, the son of the veteran actor of the King's company, laughed at the popu-

¹ *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1623-5, p. 305 (vol. vi, pp. 424-5)

² Bald, p. 165, from Egerton MS. 2623, f. 28.

³ *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1623-5, pp. 307, 308 (vol. vi, pp. 428, 429).

⁴ Act III, scene 2.

⁵ Act V, scene 8.

larity it gained Middleton with the Puritans in his *Elegy on Randolph's Finger*,¹ and even as late as 1663 Davenant referred to it as the pinnacle of theatrical popularity in his *Playhouse to Be Let*.²

The King's men themselves were evidently proud of the play's popularity and not averse to using references to it to build up that feeling of intimacy with the audience which was such a great asset to the actors of the time. This motive is apparent in both *The Northern Lass* and *The Staple of News*, plays which were written for the King's men. It is, however, in the prologue to *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, licensed only about nine weeks after the end of the 'run' of *A Game at Chesse*,³ that the company's desire to remind the audience of its recent scandalous success is most amusingly apparent. The effect upon a Blackfriars audience of a sly rendition of this mildly ironic prologue is not difficult to imagine.

Pleasure attend yee, and about yee sit
 The springs of mirth fancy delight and wit
 To stirre you up, doe not your looks let fall,
 Nor to remembrance our late errors call,
 Because this day w'are *Spaniards* all againe,
 The story of our Play, and our Sceane *Spaine*:
 The errors too, doe not for this cause hate,
 Now we present their wit and not their state.
 Nor Ladies be not angry if you see,
 A young fresh beauty, wanton and too free,
 Seek to abuse your [her] Husband, still tis *Spaine*,
 No such grosse errors in your Kingdome raignes,
 W'are *Vestalls* all, and though we blow the fire,
 We seldome make it flame up to desire,

¹ ll. 181-8

² See Bald, pp. 23-5. Mr Bald is wrong, however, when he says of the popularity of *A Game at Chesse* (p. 19), 'this is certainly the first recorded "run" in the history of the English theatre . . . and no other series of consecutive performances is heard of until after the Restoration'. Sir Henry Herbert's office-book indicates that Marmon's *Holland's Leaguer* was acted for six consecutive days in December 1631 (Herbert, p. 45); J. W.'s *Valiant Scot*, according to the Puritan *A Second Discovery by the Northern Scout*, had a run of five days in 1639, J. D.'s *Knave in Grain New Vampt* according to the 1640 title-page was 'Acted at the Fortune many dayes together', the *State Papers* say that *The Whore New Vampt* was acted 'many days together' in 1639 by the players of the Red Bull, Thomas Rawlins's *Rebellion* was 'acted nine dayes together', if the title-page may be trusted, and Thomas Jordan claims the 'record run' for his *Walks of Ishington and Hogsdon*, which, on the title-pages of both quartos, is said to have been acted nineteen days.

³ 19 October 1624 (Herbert, p. 29)

Take no example neither to beginne,
 For some by president delight to sinne.
 Nor blame the Poet if he slip aside,
 Sometimes lasciviously if not too wide.
 But hold your Fannes close, and then smile at ease,
 A cruell Sceane did never Lady please.
 Nor Gentlemen, pray be you not displeas'd,
 Though we present some men fool'd some diseases'd,
 Some drunke, some madde we meane not you, you'r free,
 We taxe no farther then our Comedie,
 You are our friends sit noble then and see ¹

After the great success of *A Game at Chesse* it is perhaps understandable that the players should have made another attempt in the same year to elude the censorship. At any rate, they were in difficulties again before the end of 1624, this time over *The Spanish Viceroy*, a play no longer extant. There is no notice of this play at the time it was performed, but that some controversy of a rather serious nature occurred between Sir Henry Herbert and the players is indicated by the following submission which he copied into his office-book in October 1633 for the benefit of the King's players as 'a remembrance against their disorders':

To Sir Henry Herbert, K^t master of his Mat^{ies} Revels.

After our humble servise remembered unto your good worship,
 Whereas not long since we acted a play called *The Spanishe Viceroy*,
 not being licensed under your worships hande, nor allowd of wee
 doe confess and herby acknowledge that wee have offended, and
 that it is in your power to punishe this offense, and are very sorry
 for it; and doe likewise promise herby that wee will not act any
 play without your hand or substituts hereafter, nor doe any
 thinge that may prejudice the authority of your office: So hoping
 that this humble submission of ours may bee accepted, wee have
 therunto sett our hands This twentieth of Decemb. 1624.

Joseph Taylor.
 Richard Robinson
 Elyard Swanston.
 Thomas Pollard.
 Robert Benfeilde.
 George Burght.

John Lowen.
 John Shancke.
 John Rice.
 Will. Rowley.
 Richard Sharpe ²

The tone of this capitulation must have been quite humble enough to please even the Master of the Revels; evidently the players felt that the consequences of their offence might have

¹ 1640 4^o HN.

² Herbert, p. 21.

been serious. What the nature of this offence was—more than the acting of an unlicensed play—we do not know. Usually there was a reason for attempts to evade the Master of the Revels. The title of the play suggests that it was anti-Spanish, but it is difficult to imagine that the players were so bold as to try a second anti-Spanish play within five months.¹

Evidently the submission was sufficient to appease Herbert, for just one week later he issued a protection for the attendants of the company. This document, with the livery warrant issued three months later, gives a very full list of the company at this time, except for the boys

These are to Certefie you That Edward Knight, William Pattrick, William Chambers, Ambrose Byland, Henry Wilson, Jeffery Collins, William Sanders, Nicholas Vnderhill Henry Clay, George Vernon, Roberte Pallant, Thomas Tuckfeild, Roberte Clarke, [George Rickner *del*] John Rhodes, William Mago, [and *del*] Anthony Knight, are all imployed by the Kinges Mat^{ties} servantes in theire quallity of Playinge as Musitions and other necessary attendantes, And are att all tymes and howers to bee readie with theire best endevo^{rs} to doe his Mat^{ties} service (dureinge the tyme of the Revells) Jn Which tyme they nor any of them are to bee arested, or deteyned vnder arest, imprisoned, Press'd for Souldiers or any other molestacon Whereby they may bee hindered from doinge his Mat^{ties} service, Without leaue firste had and obteyned of the Lo^r Chamberlyne of his Mat^{ties} most hono^{ble} houshold, or of the Maister of his Mat^{ties} Revells And if any shall presume to interrupt or deteyne them or any of them after notice hereof given by this my Certificate hee is to aunswere itt att his vtmost p[er]jill. Given att his Mat^{ties}

and Edward Ashborne,
Will Carver,
Alexander Bullard,
William Toyer,
William Gascoyne

¹ I suspect there were interesting doings in 1624. If we have the truth of the story, Herbert was certainly one of the chief offenders in *A Game at Chesse*, but we do not know what happened to him or to any of the others. Is it possible that the embarrassment of the Master of the Revels was sufficient to make the players think they might flout his authority with impunity? There must have been something unusual behind the audacity of *The Spanish Viceroy*

Office of the Revells vnder my hand and
Seale the xxvijth day of Decembr 1624

H Herbert

To all Mayo^{rs}, Sheriffes, Justices of the
Peace, Bayleiffes, Constables, knight
Ma^rshalls men, and all othe^r his Ma^{ties}
Office^{rs} to whom it may or shall apperteyne ¹

This list of Herbert's includes, of course, only the attendants of the company. The more important members at the time are to be found in the list of King's men furnished with livery for King James's funeral procession. It includes fifteen names, three more than are given in the livery lists of 1619 and 1621.² Four of the 1621 men are missing, Nicholas Tooley, John Underwood, Robert Gough, and William Ecclestone. The first three had died; we do not know what had happened to Ecclestone.³ Seven men who were allowed livery for James's funeral, Richard Sharpe, Thomas Pollard, George Birch, James Horn, George Vernon, Eliardt Swanston, and Richard Perkins, had not been in the 1621 list, though all had appeared as King's men before.⁴

From these two lists—Sir Henry Herbert's protection for the twenty-one attendants of the company and the livery list of fifteen men for the funeral of King James—it appears that at the end of 1624 and the beginning of 1625 at least thirty-five men⁵ and an unknown number of boys had an active part in the theatrical business of the King's men. That the enterprise could support such a large number at this time is a fair measure of its prosperity.⁶

¹ B.M. Add MS. 19256, p. 44. There are several inaccuracies in Halliwell-Phillipps's transcript, printed in *Herbert*, pp. 74–5, notably the reading 'Buklank' for Bullard and the omission of George Ruckner.

² See below, p. 80. The list is from the Lord Chamberlain's papers (*M.S.C.* ii. 325–6). For a discussion of the livery allowances at this time, see Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 52–5, and *M.S.C.* ii. 327 n.

³ See 'Players'.

⁴ For an attempt—often precarious—to establish the succession of these men and even the dates of their admission to membership, see Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 52–8.

⁵ George Vernon appears in both lists.

⁶ Another indirect indication of the prosperous state of the company is to be found in certain records of its patrons. John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton on 8 January 1624/5, 'The Duke of Brunswick went hence on New Year's-day, after he had tarried just a week, and performed many visits to almost all our great lords and ladies, as the Lord of Canterbury, the lord keeper and the rest, not omitting Mrs. Bruce, nor the stage at Blackfriars' (*Birch, James I*, ii. 488).

On the succession of Charles, a new patent was issued for the King's players.

Charles by the Grace of God, &c. To all Justices, Maiors, Sher-riffes, Constables, Headboroughes and other Our Officers and loveing Subjects, Greeting,

Knowe yee that Wee, of Our especiall Grace, certayne Knowledge and meere Motion, have licensed and authorized, and by these Presents, do license and authorize, these Our welbeloved Servants,

*John Hemings,
Henry Coudall,
John Lowen,
Joseph Taylor,
Richard Robinson,
Robert Benefield,
John Shanck,
William Rowley,
John Rice,
Ellliart Swanston,
George Birch,
Richard Sharpe,
And Thomas Pollard,*

And the rest of their Associates, freely to use and exercise the Art and Facultye of playing Comedies, Tragedies, Histories, Enterludes, Morralls, Pastoralls, Stage Playes, and such other like as they have already studied or hereafter shall use or study, as well for the Recreation of Our loveing Subjects, as for Our Sollace and Pleasure, when Wee shall think good to see them, dureing Our Pleasure; and the said Comedies, Tragedies, Histories, Enterludes, Morralls, Pastoralls, Stage Playes, and such like, to shoue and exercise publicuely, or otherwise to their best Comoditie, when the Infection of the Plague shall not weekely exceede the Number of Forty by the Certificate of the Lord Mayor of *London* for the time being, as well within these two theire most usuall Houses called the *Globe* within Our Countye of *Surrey*, and their private Houses scituate within the Precinct of the *Black Fryers* within Our Citty of *London*, as alsoe within any Townehalls or Moute halls, or other convenient Places within the Liberties and Freedome of any other Citty, University, Towne or Borrough whatsoever, within Our said Realmes and Dominions; willing and commanding you and every of you, and all other Our loving Subjects as you tender Our Pleasure, not onely to permitt and suffer them herein without any your Letts, Hinderances or Molestations, dureing Our aid [*sic*] Pleasure, but alsoe to be aydeing and assisting to them if any Wrong be to them offered, And to allowe them such former Curtesies as hath been given to Men of their Place and

Quality; And also what further Favour you shall shew to these Our Servants and the rest of their Associates for Our Sakes, Wee shall take kindly at your hands.

In Witnes, &c.

Witnes Our selfe at *Westmynster* the *Foure and Twentieth Day of June* [1625]¹

The only name in this patent not found in the livery list for King James's funeral is that of William Rowley. He had appeared as a King's man several times before,² but for some reason he is to be found in the funeral livery list of his old company, the Prince's men, and not the King's. Heminges and Condell, though still found heading the list of patented King's men, had long ceased to act.³

Although no new names appear in the patent of 1625, there is evidence that additions were made to the company at this time. In the notes of the Master of Requests for his first audience with King Charles at Whitehall on 12 May 1625 and under the heading of 'King James' servants' occurs the following memorandum:

His Majesty's Comedians to be sworn again in ordinary⁴

In the notes for the second audience on the 23rd of May under the heading, 'King Charles his servants', we find.

Thomas Hobbs, comedian, now left out of the number new sworn, being engaged for the stock debt of their company in 500*l.* desireth to be sworn as the rest are or to be disengaged⁵

This entry, occurring as it does under the heading 'King Charles his servants', evidently refers to the affairs of the King's men, with whom Hobbes certainly appeared later.⁶ Now this player had been a member of Prince Charles's company, which seems to have disappeared when their patron succeeded to the throne.⁷ Two other Prince Charles's men, Anthony Smith and William Penn,⁸ also appear later in the King's company. It is probable that all three of these men

¹ *Foedera*, tom xviii, 120-1.

² See 'Players'.

³ Ibid

⁴ *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Report XII, Appendix I, p. 194 (MSS. of Earl Cowper, Melbourne Hall).

⁵ Ibid., p. 198

⁶ See 'Players'.

⁷ See below, pp. 209-10.

⁸ See 'Players'. William Rowley had also been a Prince Charles's man, but he had appeared before with the King's company in 1623 and 1624, though livery for King James's funeral procession was granted him as a Prince Charles's and not as a King's man. His precise status is a little puzzling.

were transferred to their patron's new company at the time of his accession. Such a major change would probably have entailed some sort of a reorganization of the company when King Charles succeeded to his father's throne.¹

Before the new patent had reached its final stage, the theatres must have been closed for the terrible plague of 1625. Though we have no record of either the closing or the reopening order in this year, it is not difficult to tell approximately what happened. The theatres were probably closed at King James's death, 27 March 1625,² with the expectation that they would open again after his funeral, 7 May 1625.³ During this period plague deaths increased steadily and reached forty-five in the week of the funeral. Thereafter the death toll rose steeply until it reached the appalling total of 4,463 in the week ending 18 August. Probably no public performances were allowed from the King's death until about the end of November following.⁴

What the King's men did during this long period when plays were forbidden in London we do not know. At one time they must have intended to travel, for Chalmers wrote, 'It appears from Sir Henry Herbert's Official Register, that on the 1st of July, 1625, he granted a Confirmation of the King's Company's Patent to travel, for a year.'⁵ It is unlikely that the company made use of this confirmation for an ordinary tour. There is only one record of a King's company in the provinces in 1625, and that probably refers to a provincial company.⁶ Furthermore, Dekker's pamphlet, *A Rod for Run-awayes*, and the anonymous answer, *The Run-awayes Answer, to a Booke called, A Rodde for Runne-awayes*, make very clear the unpopularity of Londoners in the provinces in 1625.

The second of these pamphlets suggests that the company may have accompanied the King to Oxford, where Parliament reassembled 1 August 1625, and stayed with the court in its later wanderings.⁷ It is addressed to 'Mr. H. Condall, at his country-house in Fulham', and thanks him for a farewell entertainment; it is dated 'from Oxford and elsewhere, Sept. 10, 1625'.

¹ For a more detailed consideration of the changes in the company at this time, see Baldwin, *Organization*, pp. 52-8

² Gardiner, v. 314

⁴ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 654-7.

⁵ Herbert, p. 64

⁷ Gardiner, v. 397.

³ M S.C. ii. 325.

⁶ See below, p. 92.

Now the King had left London and was at Woking on 31 July.¹ On 21 August the Venetian ambassador wrote from Oxford,

His Majesty, after wandering to various places, took the queen to Woodstock, a royal dwelling eight miles from here, not to stay there but to regulate the affairs of the parliament and proceed to a more retired spot, as the plague springs up every where and especially follows the Court. . .²

On 26 August the ambassador wrote that the King had left for Beaulieu³ and that the Dutch ambassadors had been summoned to Southampton. On 4 September Joseph Mead wrote to Sir Martin Stuteville that Mr. Croftes had told some friends that he expected to meet the King at Woodstock on the preceding Thursday,⁴ but on the 9th the King and Queen were at Beaulieu.⁵ If King's men who had been with the court were the authors of the pamphlet, the date line of this reply to Dekker—'from Oxford and elsewhere, Sept. 10, 1625'—would be fairly accurate. Unfortunately, however, there are no records of their court attendance in this time, and the initials signed to *The Run-awayes Answer, to a Booke called, A Rodde for Runne-awayes*—B.V., S.O., T.O., A.L., and V.S.—are not those of any known players in the time. Of course it is possible that the travellers whom Condell entertained at Fulham were not players at all, much less the King's men. Still, the conjecture is tempting.

Whatever the King's men may have done during the long plague months of 1625, it must have brought them scanty return, for on 30 December 1625 the King thought it necessary to relieve their needs with a gift of one hundred marks.

Whereas we have been pleased to bestow upon the Company of our Players, who are to attend us daily at our Court this Christmas, the sum of one hundred marks for the better furnishing them with apparel: We do hereby will and command you, of our treasure in the receipt of our Exchequer, to cause present payment to be made unto Joseph Taylor, gent, one of the said company, of the said sum of one hundred marks, to the use of himself and the rest of his company of players, as of our free gift and princely bounty.⁶

¹ C.S.P., Ven., 1625-6, p. 127

² Ibid., p. 149

³ C.S.P., Ven., 1625-6, p. 154.

⁴ H.E.D.P. 1. 439. Collier does not give an adequate reference to his document, but the facts of the warrant are recorded in the Signet Office Docquets at the Public Record Office, C 82/2024.

⁵ Ibid., p. 138.
⁶ Birch, *Charles I.*, 1. 47

Such assistance for the King's company during plague visitations was apparently not unusual. Similar allowances were granted in 1630 and 1636

The wording of this warrant indicates that the gift was intended to enable the players to buy new costumes for the company wardrobe, which was almost certain to have deteriorated during the long plague period. No doubt the new costumes were enjoyed by the King himself, for ten plays were presented by the company at court during the Christmas season of 1625-6.¹

The King's men, however, soon had cause to remember that all their audiences were not royal ones. On 17 May 1626 the Privy Council wrote to the Justices of the Peace in Surrey:

Whereas wee are informed that on thursday next, diuers loose and Idle persons, some Saylor, and others, haue appointed to meete at the Playhouse called the Globe, to see a Play (as is pretended) but their ende is thereby to disguise some Routous and Riotous accon, we haue therefore thought fit to giue yo^w, notice of the informaçon which we haue receiued concerning this their purpose, And doe likewise hereby will and require yo^w, to take very carefull and strict order, that no Play be acted on that day, and also to haue that strength about yo^w, as yo^w shall thinke sufficient for the suppressing of anie insolencies, or other mutinous intensions, that yo^w shall perceiue, and to take with yo^w the vnder sheriffe of that County, for the further assisting of yo^w, if there be cause, And so not doubting of yo^r care herein. Wee Etc /²

As we find nothing further of this intended riot in the Middlesex County Records or elsewhere, we may take it for granted that the precautionary measures taken by the Surrey authorities were adequate. But there is no indication that anybody thought of paying the players for their lost day.

In these years John Heminges, who must have been nearly or quite seventy,³ was still doing official business for the company. He had long been the trusted member who received payment for performances at court,⁴ and he seems generally to have acted as treasurer or business manager for the organization. In July 1626 Sir Henry Herbert acknowledged the receipt of three pounds 'from Mr. Hemmings for a courtesie done him about their Blackfriars hous'.⁵ On 20 March 1626/7 Herbert received two pounds 'From Mr. Hemmings

(see below, pp 26-7 and 53), and King James had given them thirty pounds during the plague of 1603 and again in the plague of 1609 (Cunningham, *Revels*, pp xxxv and xxxix). Note that this is the first payment to the King's players not made payable to John Heminges.

¹ See below, p. 96.

² *M.S.C.* 1. 382.

³ See 'Players'. He was called old in 1614 and 1616.

⁴ See below, pp 94-7.

⁵ *Herbert*, p 64.

for this Lent allowanse'.¹ Three weeks later, on 11 April, the Master of the Revels again acknowledged the receipt of five pounds 'from Mr. Hemming in their company's name, to forbid the playing of Shakespeare's plays, to the Red Bull Company'.² Perhaps the most striking evidence of official confidence in him is a note which I have found among the records of petitions to the Lord Chamberlain. It is dated 24 November 1628.

A petition of Henry Ienkins against Richard Sharp debt 50^s answered (vizt) I desire M^r Hemings to satisfye the pet^r out of y^e first [such *del*] moneys acruing to Richard Sharpe either for his share or diuedent &c And this shall bee his warraunt³

Such reliance on Heminges implies an official confidence in him which must have been most valuable, on other occasions, to the company.

There is an interesting record in this year, 1628, of a notable performance at the Globe. Shortly before his assassination on 23 October 1628 the Duke of Buckingham with other great lords witnessed a performance of *Henry VIII*, apparently the Shakespeare and Fletcher play, on the Bank-side. This information is given twice in the gossip about the Duke of Buckingham in a contemporary news letter.

On Teusday his Grace was p'sent at y^e acting of King Henry 8 at y^e Globe, a play bespoken of purpose by himselfe, w^{at} he stayed till y^e Duke of Buckingham was beheaded & then departed.

On Wednesday his Grace was also spectator of y^e Rape of Lucrece at y^e Cocke-pitt.

Another Dicto

On teusday was a play at y^e Globe of y^e downfall of y^e great

¹ *Herbert*, p. 48.

² *Ibid.*, p. 64 The publication of the First Folio in 1623 not only advertised Shakespeare's plays, but it put into the hands of every purchaser the largest available collection of plays suitable for public performance. It is no wonder that the temptation was too great for at least one company. Professor Murray (*Murray*, 1 271) uses this note of Sir Henry Herbert's as his strongest evidence that after 1625 the old Prince Charles's company united with the King's provincial company and played at the Red Bull and in the provinces. According to Murray, this amalgamation accounts for the boldness of the Red Bull company in using Shakespeare's plays. The argument seems quite unconvincing to me. If the Red Bull company felt that they had a right to King's plays, they certainly would not have limited themselves to Shakespeare's, nor would Heminges have complained of the use of Shakespeare's plays only. Fletcher, for instance, was much more popular at the time and so would have been more tempting.

³ P.R.O., L.C. 5/183, p. 42. (Not in *M S C.* 11.)

Duke of Buckingham, w^runto y^e Savoian Ambassadour, y^e Duke, Earle of Hollande & oth^rs came, yet stayed only y^e disgracing not y^e beheading of y^e great Duke of Buck¹

In spite of Charles's grief at the murder of Buckingham, the King's men performed an unusually large number of plays at court in the winter of 1628-9. Though the first performance was not given until Christmas, sixteen plays were presented in the season which ended on Candlemas, 1628/9. Payment was extraordinarily prompt in this year, for a warrant for payment in full was issued to John Heminges less than four weeks after the last performance.²

Beginning in 1628, we have the record of receipts for several King's plays. On 25 May 1628 Sir Henry Herbert records that the King's company had agreed to give him their receipts for 'too dayes in the yeare, the one in summer, thother in winter, to bee taken out of the second daye of a revived playe, att my owne choyse. The housekeepers have likewyse given their shares, their dayly charge only deducted, which comes to some 2*l.* 5*s.* this 25 May, 1628'³ Herbert then gives his receipts under this agreement for five years. By adding £2. 5*s.* in each case, we can find the total takings at the Globe or Blackfriars on each of these occasions⁴

¹ From a MS. news letter at Lamport Hall, quoted by George Bullen in *The Athenaeum* for 18 October 1879. For Bullen's doubts about the identity of the play and for Halliwell-Phillipps's use of the same letter, see below, pp. 128-9.

The Tuesday mentioned by the letter-writer was probably the fifth, since this particular item is found under his correspondence of the eighth. The Duke left for Portsmouth on the 17th and was assassinated there on the 23rd (Gardiner in *DNB*).

The assertion of the letter-writer that Buckingham himself had 'bespoken' this play, if reliable, is very interesting, especially in connexion with the requested performance of another play by the same author acted in the same theatre and by the same company twenty-seven years before as a prelude to the Essex rebellion. One wonders how often noblemen asked for particular plays at the public theatres.

It would probably be rash, however, to accept the assertion of this letter-writer without question. Buckingham was generally hated at this time, and there had been several prophecies of his death. If he saw a play in the midst of an unsympathetic crowd in a public theatre and left the theatre when the actors presented the execution of the Tudor nobleman who bore his title, what excitement there must have prevailed at his departure! And how tempting for members of the audience or letter-writers to improve the story by asserting that the hated Duke had brought his embarrassment upon himself by requesting the play!

² See below, p. 96, and *M.S.C.* II 349.

³ *Herbert*, p. 43.

⁴ For an exhaustive analysis of the financial affairs of the company, see Baldwin, *Organization*, chap. vi and Appendix II.

25 May 1628	[Play unnamed]	£ 4 15 0 ¹
22 Nov 1628	<i>Custom of the Country</i>	17 10 0
21 July 1629	<i>Prophesess</i>	6 07 0
22 Nov. 1629	<i>Moor of Venice</i>	9 16 0
Summer, 1630	No play—plague	
18 Feb 1630/1	<i>Every Man in His Humour</i>	12 04 0
12 June 1631	<i>Richard II</i>	5 06 0
1 Dec 1631	<i>Alchemist</i>	13 00 0
Summer, 1632	[Play unnamed]	1 05. 0
6 Nov 1632	<i>Wild Goose Chase</i>	15 00 0
6 June 1633	[Play unnamed]	4 10 0 ²

According to these figures, Herbert's receipts averaged £8. 19s. 4d. If we add the £2. 5s which Sir Henry says the housekeepers deducted for expenses, we find that in these five years the company took an average of £6. 13s. 8d. at the summer performances designated and an average of £15 15s. at the winter performances. Perhaps they expected greater returns later, for on 30 October 1633 they agreed in lieu of the receipts at these two performances to pay Herbert ten pounds twice a year, which agreement Chalmers says they faithfully carried out.³

On 6 May 1629 livery was allowed to fifteen of the King's men. The list includes all those given livery in 1625 except Condell, Perkins, Birch, and Rice. Condell was dead; Rice had apparently retired, as he received a legacy in 1630 as Clerk of St. Saviour's; Perkins had become a member of Queen Henrietta's at the Cockpit; Birch simply disappears.⁴ The only new names in this livery list are Anthony Smith, Thomas Hobbes, and William Penn, all of whom had come from Prince Charles's old company.⁵

In September 1629 there is a notice not directly connected with the company, but significant here because it has led to no little confusion about the King's men. On 18 September 1629 William Perry was granted a commission 'for making up and keeping a company of players, to present all usual stage plays, by the name of His Majesty's servants for the city of York'.⁶ Two weeks before, he had been sworn a groom of the chamber,⁷ and three years later, in February 1632/3, a licence was issued to 'William Perry and his Associates to practize the quality of stage playes in y^e Citty of Yorke &

¹ Herbert says that this day was 'a very unseasonable one in respect of the weather'.

² *Herbert*, pp 43-4

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁶ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1629-31, p. 59 (No. 61)

³ *Ibid*, p. 44.

⁵ See above, pp 18-19.

⁷ *M.S.C.* ii. 351.

else where wthin his Ma^{tes} dominions'.¹ These three items and many provincial records of the visits of William Perry² and the King's players establish the fact that there was a provincial company of King's players, apparently independent of the London organization, for Perry never appears in any list of the London company. The existence of Perry's company makes it highly probable that many of the provincial records of a King's company refer to his organization and not to the London company, even when Perry's name is not mentioned.³

Later in the autumn of 1629 a theatre belonging to the King's men was used on at least one occasion by a visiting troupe of French players. The office-book of the Master of the Revels records a fee,

For the allowinge of a French company to playe a farse at Blackfryers, this 4 of November, 1629,—2^l os. od.⁴

The reception which these players had at Blackfriars is recorded in a letter written 8 November 1629 by Thomas Brande:

Furthermore you should know, that last daye certaine vagrant French players, who had beene expelled from their owne contrey, *and those women*, did attempt, thereby giving just offence to all vertuous and well-disposed persons in this town, to act a certain lacrivious and unchaste comedye, in the French tonge at the Blackfryers. Glad I am to saye they were hissed, hooted, and pippinpelted from the stage, so as I do not thinke they will soone be ready to trie the same againe —Whether they had licence for so doing I know not; but I do know that, if they had licence, it were fit that the Master [of the Revels] be called to account for the same.⁵

The opposition to the French actors cannot have been quite so overwhelming as Brande implies, for Herbert's records show that they performed on at least two later occasions at the Red Bull and at the Fortune, though they had 'ill fortune'.⁶ Probably the King's men were not sorry to see

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 360

² See 'Players'.

³ It seems probable that this provincial company was the same as the London Red Bull company. For an account of the organization, see below, pp. 270-82.

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 59

⁵ *H.E.D.P.* i. 452-3. Pryrne notes the presence of these actors at Blackfriars. See *Histrionmastix*, pp. 215 and 414 n.

⁶ *Herbert*, pp. 59-60

them leave the Blackfriars if their reception was anything like so violent as Brande would have us believe.

There is a suggestion in a set of verses which Carew wrote for the first quarto of Davenant's *The Just Italian* that the King's men were suffering rather severe competition in 1629. This play was licensed to the King's company by Sir Henry Herbert on the 2nd of October 1629,¹ and entered in the Stationers' Register 10 January 1629/30, so that the verses probably refer to the autumn of 1629. Carew complains about the ill success of Davenant's play, talks of the crowds at the Red Bull and Cockpit, and continues,

Whilst the true brood of Actors, that alone
Keepe naturall vnstrayn'd Action in her throne
Behold their Benches bare, though they rehearse
The tearser *Beaumonts* or great *Iohnsons* verse²

There can be no doubt that the troupe which Carew says was playing to bare benches was the King's men, for they had produced Davenant's play, and they owned most of Jonson and Beaumont. Perhaps his statement should not be taken too seriously, since Carew is trying to account for the failure of Davenant's play; the suggestion is there, however.

During the summer and autumn of 1630 plays were prohibited because of the plague. As compared with 1625, the plague of 1630 was mild, but the theatres were nevertheless closed for seven months, only one month less than in 1625. Sir Henry Herbert issued his closing order on the 17th of April and did not allow the companies to begin playing again until the 12th of November.³

We have no evidence that the King's men travelled during this time.⁴ As in the plague of 1625, Charles took steps to relieve the distress into which their idleness must have thrown them.

Whereas we have given order, that our servant John Heming,⁵

¹ *Herbert*, p. 32

² See below, pp 224-5, for the entire poem

³ See the Plague Appendix, p. 657

⁴ See below, p 92

⁵ This order contains the last reference to John Heminges as leader or manager of the company, for he died between the 9th of October, when he made his will, and the 12th, when he was buried in his old parish of St Mary's Aldermanbury (see 'Players') He was succeeded as business manager by John Lowin and Joseph Taylor, who are the usual recipients of payments

and the rest of our Players, shall attend upon us and our dearest Consort the Queene at our next coming to Hampton Court And forasmuch as we are graciously pleased, in regard of their great hinderance *of late received*, whereby they are disabled to attend this service, to bestow upon them the somme of one hundred pounds, . as of our free guift and bountie, without any accompt imprest or other charge to be set upon him or them. . . Given under our Signet at our Pallace of Westminster, the 20 day of September, in the sixt year of our raigne.¹

That the King's men did attend 'at our next coming to Hampton Court' and gave their first play of the season there only ten days after the issuance of this order, we now know from the recently discovered bill for plays presented by the company at court in 1630-1² This very interesting bill sets forth the performances of the company at court in that season as follows:

Playes for the Kinge this present
yeare of o^r Lord God 1630³

At [H]ampton Court	{	The 30 th of September, The Inconstant Ladye. The 3 of October Alfonso The 17 of October . Midsomers Night's Dreame The 24 of October . The Custome of the Contrie
-----------------------	---	--

for the King's men—often associated with Eyllaerd Swanston—until the closing of the theatres It seems that they were generally recognized as leaders of the troupe, for when Richard Kendall, the wardrobe keeper for the company at Salisbury Court, told Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of Queen's, Oxford, about the London companies (see Appendix, p 688), he spoke of

1 The Kings Company at y^e private house of
Blackfriars The masters or cheife whereof
are { Mr Talor
Mr Lowen

Our knowledge of the King's men would indicate that Lowin and Taylor were business managers rather than masters, but they must have been the most conspicuous members of the company to rival actors.

¹ *H E D P* 1. 459 This document does not appear in the *Malone Society Collections*, but it is to be found in a slightly different form in the *Docquet Book of the Signet Office* under date of September 1630 (PSO. 2/86, CS2/2061).

² So far as I know, this bill, which has not been printed before, was first referred to by Professor R C Bald (*The Library*, N S xviii [1938], 290), when he noted that one of the plays produced was Arthur Wilson's *The Inconstant Lady* I am deeply indebted to Dr J. Q Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, for generous permission to reprint this unique document which was destined for reproduction in a special volume of 'The Folger Shakespeare Library Publications'

³ MS. 2068 8 Folger Shakespeare Library, entitled 'Playes', &c

THE KING'S COMPANY

At the
[Co]ck-pitt

The 5 of November, An Induction for the
Howse,¹ And The Madd Louer
The 7 of November . Rollo
The 19 of November . The Fox
The 28 of November . Beauty in a Traunce .
The 30 of November . Beggers Bushe .
The 9 of December . The Maides Tragedy
The 14 of December . Philaster .
The 26 of December . The Duches of Malfy .
The 27 of December . The Scornfull Ladie
The 30 of December . Chaunces
The 6 of Januarie . Olde Castle .
The 3 of Februarie . The Fatall Dowrie
The 10 of februarie . The kinge and No kinge
The 15 of februarie . The merry Devill of Ed-
monton
The 17 of februarie . Euerie man in's Humor
The 21 of februarie . Rollo, and
the daie at the howse loste . [20³]

[²] first & y^e. last double.

¹ This 'Induction for the Howse' is without parallel so far as I know and at first defies identification. Evidently the players thought of it as a separate play; witness the form of the entry for 5 November in the bill. We have evidence that the Lord Chamberlain thought of it as a separate play, too, for his warrant for payment for these performances specifies twenty-one plays, and the list contains only twenty unless the 'Induction' is counted as a separate play. There can be no mistaking the fact that the Lord Chamberlain's warrant applies to this list, for he is unusually explicit, speaking of 'foure Playes Acted at Hampton Court . . . [and] one other Play which was Acted in the day time at Whitehall, by meanes wherof the Players lost the benefitt of their House for that day. And Ten poundes apiece for sixteene other Playes acted before his Mat^{ie} at Whitehall amounting in all vnto the somme of Two Hundred & Sixty poundes for one & Twenty playes his Mat^{es} servantes Acted before his Mat^{ie}, & the Queene at severall times betweene the 30th of September & the 21th of febr^y last past As it may appeare by this annexed schedule' (*M S C* 11 354-5). Indeed one might hazard the conjecture that the Folger MS. is the very schedule which the Lord Chamberlain attached to his warrant.

What then is this additional piece which both the players and the Lord Chamberlain thought of as another play and which was given on the same night as *The Mad Lover*? Its place at the head of the list of plays designated 'At the Cockpitt' suggests to me that it was some sort of house-warming piece for the new court theatre, the Cockpit in Whitehall. That the Cockpit was done over about this time to make of it a more adequate house for court performances has long been known from a prologue of Heywood's entitled *A speech spoken to their two excellent Majesties, at the first Play play'd by the Queenes Servants, in the new Theater at White Hall*.

This speech has been dated 1632 or 1633 because of a supposed association with Heywood's prologue for the *Jew of Malta*, which was printed in 1633 and probably acted at court in 1632. I can see no reason for this association, since the only evidence offered is that both appeared in *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas* in 1637 (Adams, p. 395). Since there are

The number of plays on this bill, the largest number given by the company in any court season so far in our period, together with the King's free gift of £100, is ample evidence of the popularity of the troupe with their sovereign. Equally notable is the testimony of the great popularity of Beaumont and Fletcher at court. That ten of the twenty evenings enumerated in the bill should have witnessed performances of Beaumont and Fletcher plays, half of them fifteen years old, speaks eloquently of the advantage which ownership of these plays gave the King's men.

There is evidence that the theatres were closed again because of plague in the spring of 1631. Though the evidence for this closing has not been generally recognized, a note in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book and correspondence found among the State Papers implies that there was a brief prohibition of acting some time between the middle of February and the middle of June.¹

In the year 1632 there are no records of any unusual activities of the King's men. They presented eleven plays at court in the Christmas season of 1631-2 and twenty-three between 3 May 1632 and the third of March following.² Sir Henry Herbert's office-book records two of the plays

twenty or twenty-one sets of prologues and epilogues in this section of the book, and since the speech at Whitehall is printed second and the prologues and epilogues to *The Jew of Malta* last, I can see no reason for associating them in date. Actually there is some doubt whether the prologues and epilogues to *The Jew of Malta* ever appeared in *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas* at all. They are not found in the Huntington, Folger, or University of Chicago copies, or in Bang's reprint in *Materialien*. They do appear in Pearson's reprint in his edition of Heywood. I have not yet been able to determine whether Pearson used an unknown variant issue or simply made a gross blunder. In any case the evidence for dating the 'speech in the new Theater at White Hall' by the prologues and epilogues to *The Jew of Malta* seems to me negligible. Without this evidence the case for the opening of the new theatre in 1632 falls to the ground, and I can see no reason for not accepting the implication of this bill that the new theatre was opened with *An Induction for the Howse* performed by the King's men 5 November 1630.

Slight confirmatory evidence for this conclusion is found in the unprecedentedly large number of plays performed at court in the season of 1630-1. Only once before in their entire history (1611-12) and never before in our period are the King's men known to have performed so many plays at court. Never in their entire history did Queen Henrietta's men give so many court performances as in this year—sixteen. A total of thirty-seven plays at court by two companies in about four and one-half months, especially when compared with the figures for earlier years, suggests that the court had a new theatrical toy in 1630-1.

¹ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 658-9.

² See below, p. 97.

licensed to them, Massinger's *City Madam* on 25 April and Jonson's *Magnetic Lady* on 12 October.¹

Several records of attendance at plays presented by the King's men are extant for the year 1633. Sir Humphrey Mildmay attended a play at the Blackfriars on the 22nd of January, and on the 16th of May, the 23rd of May, the 8th of June, and the 18th of July he saw plays at the Globe.² The one on the 23rd of May was *Rollo, Duke of Normandy, or The Bloody Brother*, which seems to have been one of the more popular plays in the repertory of the company,³ but Sir Humphrey does not give the names of any of the others.

The year 1633 must have been a very trying one for the King's men, or at least for the business managers of the company. There was first the trouble about the lease of the Globe. When the second Globe had been under construction in 1614, the Burbages, Heminges, and Condell had got young Matthew Brend's signature to a lease which extended their term of occupancy from 25 December 1635 to 25 December 1644.⁴ In 1633, however, Sir Matthew Brend, as he had become, thought better of his Bankside property and sought to cancel the extension which he had executed as a minor and to terminate the lease in 1635. His motive (according to Professor Wallace, who discovered the documents of the Court of Requests suit to which this attempt led and who said in 1914⁵ that they were shortly to be published, though they have not yet appeared) was to 'lease the Globe now to others over the heads of the old company at an enormous rent'. Who these 'others' were is not known, in fact, there is no specific indication that his proposed new tenants were actors at all, though that is the assumption.⁶

¹ See below, p. 105.

² See Appendix, p. 675. It should be noted that the proportion of plays seen at the Globe is most unusual. In the diary as a whole, Sir Humphrey mentions the Blackfriars fourteen times and the Globe four. More than three-fourths of his visits to the theatre were made during the winter months when the Globe was, presumably, closed.

³ See below, p. 109.

⁴ Adams, pp. 256-7.

⁵ In the second of his articles on 'Shakespeare and the Globe', *The Times* (London), 1 May 1914.

⁶ Our general information about the comparative popularity of public and private theatres at this time might well lead one to doubt whether the Globe could have been so very valuable in 1633. Sir Henry Herbert's records of his receipts from the company 1628-33 indicate that the average takings at the Blackfriars were twice those at the Globe (see above, p. 24). It is evident that the Bankside theatre no longer compared with the Blackfriars in public interest. In the casual references of Caroline literature, the Blackfriars must be mentioned five times for every one that the Globe is

The company eventually succeeded in establishing the validity of their lease until 1644, though there was a 'long litigation',¹ and on 31 December 1635 John Shank had not yet received his 'Lease which I am to have of Three Eight parts in the moiety of the Globe Playhouse for the Terme of Nyne yeares from Christmas last [1635] which I bought, and paid deere for'.²

The matter of the extension of the Globe lease was still pending when trouble arose over the Blackfriars theatre, this time not with the landlord but with the Puritan inhabitants of the parish of St Anne's.

It will be recalled that the people of Blackfriars had complained about the playhouse in 1619.³ In 1631 there had been further petitioning for the suppression of the theatre there

named. When Kendall told Crosfield of the London companies and theatres in 1634, he did not even mention the Globe, but said simply, 'The Kings Company at y^e private house of Blackfriars'. The inferior position of the Globe is made very clear in the prologue to Shirley's *Doubtful Heir* (licensed as *Rosania* 1 June 1640 and published in 1652).

All that the Prologue comes for, is to say,
Our Author did not calculate this Play
For this Meridian, the Banckside, he knows,
Are far more skilfull at the Ebbes and flows
Of water, than of wit, he did not mean
For the elevation of your poles, this scene.
No shews, no dance, and what you most delight in,
Grave understanders, here's no target fighting
Upon the Stage, all work for Cutlers barr'd,
No bawdery, nor no Ballets, this goes hard;
But language clean, and what affects you not,
Without impossibilities the Plot,
No clown, no squibs, no Devill in't, oh now
You Squirrels that want Nuts, what will you do?
Pray do not crack the benches; and we may
Hereafter fit your Palats with a Play
But you that can contract your selves, and sit
As you were now in the *Black-Fryers* pit,
And will not deaf us, with leud noise and tongues,
Because we have no Heart to break our Lungs,
Will pardon our vast Stage, and not disgrace
This Play, meant for your persons, not the place.

Perhaps the relative importance of the two theatres is best indicated by the fact that on the title-pages of the plays performed by the King's men from 1616 to 1642 the Blackfriars is mentioned fifty-nine times and the Globe only thirteen, and this in spite of the fact that most of the plays must have been acted at both theatres.

All this disparity, however, may indicate only that the Blackfriars was the theatre of fashionable appeal, while for the actors the pennies of twelve 'stinkards' were as good as the shilling of Sir Humphrey Mildmay, especially if the pennies were taken in the summer when most of the fashionable patrons of Blackfriars, like Sir Humphrey, were out of town.

¹ Wallace, *The Times*, 1 May 1914.

² See his will, pp. 646-8

³ See above, pp. 4-5.

The 1631 petition was directed to the Bishop of London, but the complaints were much the same as those of the earlier document. Copies of the order of 22 June 1600 limiting the London theatres to two and of the 1619 petition and closing order accompanied this complaint, and the Lord Bishop endorsed them all 'To the Council table', but we have no account that any action was taken on them at that time.¹

Finally, in 1633, the matter came up again, and steps were then taken to satisfy the people of Blackfriars. The Privy Council Register for the sitting of 9 October 1633 records that the Board, noting particularly the inconvenience caused by the coaches and

calling to mynde that formerly vpon Complaint hereof made, the Board was of opinion, that the said Play house was fitt to be removed from thence, and that an indifferent Recompence & allowance should be giuen them for theire Interests in the said house, and buildings therunto belonging,²

appointed a committee to examine the interested parties and evaluate the property. On the 20th of November this commission reported:

Blackfriars' playhouse. The players demand 21,000*l*. The Commissioners valued it at near 3,000*l*. The parishioners offer towards the removing of them 100*l*.³

¹ This petition is quoted in full, Adams, pp 228-30.

² *M.S.C.* 1. 386.

³ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1633-4, p. 293. Collier printed a certificate from the Justices of the Peace of Middlesex giving these estimates in detail (*H.E.D.P.* 1. 477-8). Though this certificate has been suspected, Sir Edmund Chambers (*M.S.C.* 1. 386) thinks it is genuine, since its main figures are confirmed by the notes of the Council meeting of 20 November, of which Collier knew nothing. The certificate says that upon examination the players demanded £16,000 and, when asked for a detailed appraisal, presented one which totalled £21,990. Then the committee, with the consent of the players, valued the property as follows

'1 First for the Playhouse itself, whereof the Company hath taken a lease for diuers years yet to come, of Cutbert Burbidge and William Burbidge (who haue the inheritance thereof) at the rent of 50*l* per Ann.. we value the same after the same rate, at 14 years' purchase, as an indifferent recompence to the said Burbidges, which cometh to 700*l*

'2. For 4 tenements, near adjoining to the Playhouse, for the which they receive 75*l*. per annum rent, and for a void piece of ground there, to turn coaches in, which they value at 6*l* per Ann, making together 81*l* per Ann.: the purchase thereof, at 14 years, likewise cometh to 1134*l*. They demand further, in respect of the interest, that some of them haue by lease in the said Playhouse, and in respect of the Shares which others haue in the benefit thereof, and for the damage they all pretend they shall sustain by their remove, not knowing where to settle themselves again (they being 16 in number) the sum of 2400*l*., viz., to each of them 150*l*. But we conceiue they may be brought to accept of the sum of 1066*l*. 13*s* 4*d*., which is to each of them 100 markes. . . . 20 Nov. 1633.'

One glance at these figures is enough to tell us why the project of buying out the players was not carried through. The whole affair resolved itself into a discussion of the traffic problem, which received much the same solution as such problems do to-day. After a few pompous remarks about the difficulty, their lordships recommended that patrons attend the theatre by water or on foot and then ordered

that if anie p[er]son man or woman of what Condiçon soever repaire to the aforesayd Playhouse in Coach so soone as they are gone out of their Coaches the Coach men shall departe thence and not retourne till the ende of the play, nor shall stay or retourne to fetch those whom they carryed anie nearer wth their Coaches then the farther parte of St Pauls Church yarde on the one syde, and ffeet-Conduite on the other syde, and in y^e tyme betweene their departure and returne shall either returne home or else abide in some other streets lesse frequented with passengers and so range their Coaches in those places that the way be not stopped, w^{ch} Order if anie Coachman disobey, the next Constable or Officer is hereby charged to coffit him p^rsently to Ludgate or Newgate.¹

This excellent solution remained effective for a whole month, until the 29th of December, when the Council declared,

Vpon Informaçon this day giuen to the Board of the discomoditie that diuers p[er]sons of greate quality especially Ladies and Gentlewomen, did receiue in going to the Playhouse of Blackfriars, by reason that noe Coaches may stand wthin the Blackfriars Gate or retourne thither dureing the Play, and of the p^riudice the Players his ma^{ties} Servants doe receiue therby. But especially that the Streetes are soe much the more incumberred wth the said Coaches The Board takeing into Consideraçon the former order of the 20th of Nouember last concerning this busines, did thinke fitt to explaine the said order, in such manner that as many Coaches as may stand wthin the Blackfriars Gate, may may [sic] enter and stay ther, or retourne thither at the end of the Play.²

Perhaps the objections to the order are better expressed in a letter of 9 January 1633/4, from Mr. Garrard.

Here hath been an Order of the Lords of the Council hung up in a Table near *Paul's* and the *Black-Fryars*, to command all that Resort to the Play-House there to send away their Coaches, and to disperse Abroad in *Paul's Church-Yard*, *Carter-Lane*, the Conduit in *Fleet-street*, and other Places, and not to return to fetch their Company, but they must trot afoot to find their Coaches,

¹ M.S.C. 1. 387-8.

² Ibid., pp. 388-9.

'twas kept very strictly for two or three Weeks, but now I think it is disorder'd again ¹

And so ended, for the time being,² the war between the players and the citizens of Blackfriars. There are numerous hints in these documents that the players had powerful friends at court. One is tempted, even, to read some significance into the fact that the King himself was present at the Council meeting of 29 December when the restraining order was nullified.

There are one or two other items of interest to be noted concerning this company during the time of their difficulties with the people of Blackfriars. On 6 May 1633 a puzzling warrant directed to John Lowin and Joseph Taylor was issued from the office of the Lord Chamberlain. It reads:

Wheras the late decease, infirmity & sicknes of diuerse principall Actors of his Ma^{tes} Company of Players hath much decayed & weakened them, soe that they are disabled to doe his Ma^{ty} service in their quality, vnlesse there bee some speedy order taken to supply & furnish them with a convenient number of new Actors His Ma^{tye} haueing taken notice thereof & signified his royall pleasure vnto mee therin, Theis are to will & require you & in his Ma^{tes} name straitly to charge, commaund & Authorize you & either of you to choose, receaue & take into yo^r Company any such Actor or Actors belonging to any of the lycensed Companyes wthin & about the City of London as you shall thinke fitt & able to doe his Ma^{ty} service in that kinde. Heerin you may not fayle And This shall bee your sufficient Warrant & discharge in that behalfe. Court at Whitehall the 6th of May. 1633/
To Iohn Lowen and Ioseph
Taylor two of the Company of
his Ma^{tes} Players.³

¹ *Strafforde's Letters*, 1 175-6.

² The parish was petitioning against the theatre again seven years later. See below, p 64

³ *M S C. n.* 361. It may be that this warrant is a mark of the special favour which the Lord Chamberlain had for the King's company. The King's men themselves bear witness to his consideration of them, for in the dedication of the 1623 folio to Montgomery and his brother, the then Lord Chamberlain, Heminges and Condell speak of '*the many fauours we haue receiued from your L.L.*' A quarter of a century later ten members of the old King's company again testify to the special favours of the ex-Lord Chamberlain, then the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, in the dedication of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647. After recalling that their fellows had dedicated the Shakespeare folio to him and his brother, they continue, '*and since, [we are] more particularly bound to your Lordships most constant and diffusive Goodnesse, from which, wee did for many cayme yeares deriue a subsistence to ourselues, and Protection to the Scene (now withered, and condemn'd, as we feare, to a long Winter and sterilitie) we haue presumed to offer your Selfe, what before was never printed of these Authours*'.

The privilege granted to the King's men in this warrant is unique in the theatrical annals of the time. If the wording of the warrant is to be trusted, the document is another testimonial of Charles's personal interest in the company; so long as the warrant remained in force, the superiority of the troupe at Blackfriars could not be challenged. I know of no confirmation of the alleged 'decease, infirmity & sicknes of diuerse principall Actors', or of any other serious inroads into the company at this time.¹ It may be that several actors were too ill to perform, though they recovered and returned to the stage later. Such a misfortune would be serious for the company but would leave no record for us such as deaths, retirements, and transfer to other companies leave

It is possible, as Professor Baldwin has pointed out,² that this warrant is the result of a petition which had been recorded in the Lord Chamberlain's petition book in November 1632, and which was first noted by Professor Allardyce Nicoll.³ The petition reads as follows:

A petition of William Blagraue & William Beeston that his Lo^p would restore vnto them a boy named Stephen Hamerton inueigled from them by one Christopher Babham & by him imployed at the Blackfryars playhouse Answered vizt I desire Sr Henry Herbert Kn^t. M^r of the Reuells to his Ma^{tie} to take this petition

¹ In the four years preceding the date of the recruiting warrant, the following adult actors, important enough to receive livery in 1629, disappeared: John Heminges was buried 12 October 1630; Richard Sharpe was buried 25 January 1631/2. Anthony Smith does not appear after the cast of *The Swisser*, 1631, James Horne and George Vernon do not appear after the livery list of 1629. It seems doubtful that the company would still be worrying about replacing Heminges (who had not acted since 1612 or 1613) nearly three years after his death, or Richard Sharpe a year and three months after his. Since we do not know what happened to Smith, Horne, and Vernon, it is possible that they had died or left the company shortly before the warrant was issued, but, so far as is known, they were never important enough to be called principal actors.

The most important adult players in the livery list of 1629 were John Lowin, Joseph Taylor, Richard Robinson, John Shank, Robert Benfield, Richard Sharpe, Eyllaerd Swanston, and Thomas Pollard. All but Sharpe were still in the company at the time of the warrant.

² Baldwin, *Organization*, p. 193, n. 52. Professor Baldwin is clearly wrong, however, in saying that by this warrant the company was 'empowered to take any acting apprentice or hired man they had a mind to' and thus implying that *members* of other companies were, of course, exempt. The warrant clearly states that 'principall Actors' of the King's company were incapacitated and were to be replaced by 'any such Actor or Actors belonging to any of the lycensed Companies'. Hired men and apprentices could not take the places of 'principall Actors' of the King's company.

³ *T.L.S.*, 22 November 1923.

into his consideration & to make such an accommodacōn of the difference therin mentioned as may bee best for his Ma^{tes} service & the satisfaccōn of the pet^{rs} Or certifie mee the true state therof & what hee conceaueth fitt to bee done therin / Nou 12 1632.¹

Blagrove and Beeston were probably connected with the management of the company at Salisbury Court at this time, for Blagrove had been one of the owners of that theatre when it was built in 1629, and he was paid in 1634/5 for performances by the Salisbury Court company at court in 1631.² This is young Beeston's first appearance in a theatrical connexion. Probably Hammerton had been used as a boy actor at the Salisbury Court, though it is uncertain whether Prince Charles's men or the King's Revels were at that theatre in November 1632.

It is certain that Hammerton acted at this time for the King's company, for he appears as Oriana in the cast for *The Wild Goose Chase* which was published in the 1652 quarto. Presumably this cast is the one for the performance of the autumn of 1632, for Sir Henry Herbert received fifteen pounds from a performance of the play at Blackfriars, 6 November 1632.³ Probably the King's men kept the boy, for he was certainly an important member of the company later. It may be, then, that the warrant of 6 May 1633 is only the official authorization of a practice which the King's men had begun at least seven months before in the case of Stephen Hammerton.

One would expect that the exercise of such a privilege as the Lord Chamberlain granted the King's men in this recruiting warrant would cause trouble. There are no records of such trouble, however—indeed we do not even have any reliable evidence that the company ever chose to exercise its privilege. The whole matter of this curious warrant must remain, for the present, a subject for speculation.

In the autumn of 1633 there was another disagreement between Sir Henry Herbert and the King's company concerning the censorship. On this occasion, however, the players seem to have accepted the restriction more docilely than they sometimes did. Herbert's account of the affair explains itself.

¹ *M S C.* ii. 408.

³ *Herbert*, p. 44.

² See 'Players'.

On friday the nineteenth¹ of October, 1633, I sent a warrant by a messenger of the chamber to suppress *The Tamer Tamd*,² to the Kings players, for that afternoone, and it was obeyd, upon complaints of foule and offensive matters conteyned therein

They acted *The Scornful Lady* instead of it, I have enterd the warrant here

'These are to will and require you to forbear the actinge of your play called *The Tamer Tamd*, or the *Taminge of the Tamer*, this afternoone, or any more till you have leave from mee and this at your perill On friday morninge the 18 Octob. 1633

'To Mr Taylor, Mr Lowins, or any of the King's players at the Blackfryers'

On saturday morninge followinge the booke was brought mee, and at my lord of Hollands request I returned it to the players ye monday morninge after, purgd of oaths, prophaness, and ribaldrye, being ye 21 of Octob 1633.

Because the stoppinge of the actinge of this play for that afternoone, it being an ould play, hath rayseed some discourse in the players, thogh no disobedience, I have thought fitt to insert here ther submission upon a former disobedience, and to declare that it concernes the Master of the Revells to bee carefull of their ould revived playes, as of their new, since they may conteyne offensive matter, which ought not to be allowed in any time.

'Mr Knight,

'In many things you have saved mee labour, yet wher your judgment or penn fayld you, I have made boulde to use mine. Purge ther parts, as I have the booke And I hope every hearer and player will thinke that I have done God good servise, and the quality no wronge; who hath no greater enemies than oaths, prophaness, and publike ribaldry, wh^{ch} for the future I doe absolutely forbid to bee presented unto mee in any playbooke, as you will answer it at your perill. 21 Octob. 1633.'

This was subscribed to their play of *The Tamer Tamd*, and directed to Knight, their book-keeper.

The 24 Octob 1633, Lowins and Swanston were sorry for their ill manners, and craved my pardon, which I gave them in presence of Mr. Taylor and Mr Benfelde.³

I assume that the ill manners for which Lowin and Swanston apologized were part of the 'discourse' which 'the stop-

¹ An error for the 18th.

² *The Woman's Prize*, by Fletcher. It was performed at court on 28 November 1633, and 'very well likt'.

³ *Herbert*, pp. 20-1

pinge of the acting of this play for that afternoone, it being an ould play, hath rayسد'.

Immediately following this affair of *The Tamer Tamed*, we have a note of Herbert's about another offending play of the King's men, concerning which they seem to have been less tractable. The Master of the Revels says,

Upon a second petition of the players to the High Commission court, wherein they did mee right in my care to purge their plays of all offense, my lords Grace of Canterbury bestowed many words upon mee, and discharged mee of any blame, and layd the whole fault of their play, called *The Magnetick Lady*, upon the players. This happened the 24 of Octob 1633, at Lambeth. In their first petition they would have excused themselves on mee and the poett.¹

This extract is more obscure than the preceding one from Herbert's office-book. Ben Jonson's play had been licensed a year before, on 12 October 1632.² Why should the objection to it have been so long delayed? From the players' own admission and from the fact that Herbert had approved the play in 1632, we may assume that it was the interpolations of the actors to which the objections were raised. Some punishment must have been meted out to them, but I know of no further references to the affair.

Whatever difficulties the King's players may have had with the Court of High Commission and Sir Henry Herbert, they managed to keep in the good graces of the royal family and more particularly of the Queen. Not only were their performances at court more numerous than those of any other company in this time, but they were granted special privileges which must have been a great annoyance to their competitors, especially in a time when costume was the greatest item of expense for the actors. Sir Henry Herbert records one of the most notable examples of royal favour in the winter of 1633-4, though the gitt itself had evidently been bestowed a year earlier. On Twelfth Night, 1633/4, the

¹ *Herbert*, pp. 21-2.

² *Ibid*, p. 34. Surely this play was not revived after it had been so thoroughly damned (*Jonson Allusion Book*, pp. 177-86). Adams and Bradley suggest (*ibid*, p. 177) that Malone may have made a mistake and copied 1632 instead of 1633 as the licence date. Their suggestion cannot be allowed, however, for Herford and Simpson (*Ben Jonson*, II, 203) note a letter of 20 September 1632 saying that Jonson 'hath written a play against next terme called the Magnetick lady'. If there is a mistake, a more reasonable suggestion would be 1632 instead of 1633 for the Court of High Commission hearing.

Queen feasted the King at Somerset House, and part of the entertainment was a performance of Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* by the King's men, 'in the clothes the Queene had given Taylor the year before of her owne pastorall'.¹

The Queen's patronage of the players was also evidenced by her attendance at their playhouse in Blackfriars. Sir Henry Herbert notes one such occasion in May following the performances at Somerset House: 'The 13 May, 1634, the Queene was at Blackfriars to see Messengers playe.'² Probably this performance was not a public but a private one given for the Queen at Blackfriars, like those of 5 May 1636 and 23 April 1638, for which we know the company was paid as for a performance at court.³ Nevertheless, the Queen's visit to Blackfriars must have been widely known and surely enhanced the prestige of the King's men. Sir Henry Herbert's note does not indicate that it was unusual for the Queen to be at Blackfriars, certainly she was there again two or three years later.⁴

Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw several performances by the King's men in 1634. In January and February he saw three plays at Blackfriars; those seen on 21 January and 7 February are unnamed, but on 22 January the play was Davenant's *The Wits*, which the King had examined and corrected with his own hand after Endymion Porter's complaints of Sir Henry Herbert's severe censorship.⁵ The performance of *The Spartan Ladies*, which Sir Humphrey saw on the 1st of May, may have been by the King's men, since most of Carlell's other plays belonged to them, but neither theatre nor company is mentioned. On 9 November he saw *Catiline*, which had been the property of the company for more than twenty years, acted at court, and on 12 December he saw

¹ Ibid., p. 53. This gift was no secret, for George Garrard told the Lord Deputy about it in a letter three days after the performance: 'I never knew a duller *Christmas* than we had at Court this Year, but one Play all the Time at *Whitehall*, and no dancing at all. The Queen had some little Infirmitie, a Bile, or some such Thing, which made her keep in, only on Twelfth-night she feasted the King at *Somerset-house*, and presented him with a Play, newly studied, long since printed, *the Faithful Shepherdess*, which the King's Players acted in the Robes she and her Ladies acted their Pastoral in the last Year' (*Strafforde's Letters*, i, 177).

² Ibid., p. 65. Malone adds, 'The play which her majesty honoured with her presence was *The Tragedy of Cleander*, which had been produced on the 7th of the same month.'

³ Adams, pp. 232-3.

⁴ See below, p. 48 and n. 5.

⁵ See below, pp. 106-7.

Davenant's *Love and Honour*, which had been licensed about three weeks before.¹

Bulstrode Whitelocke must have been another of the patrons of Blackfriars about this time. He says after his discussion of the masque of 1633/4,

I was so conversant with the musitians, and so willing to gaine their favour, especially at this time, that I composed an Aier myself, with the assistance of Mr Ives, and called it *Whitelocke's Coranto*, which being cried up, was first played publiquely, by the Blackefryar's Musicke, who were then esteemed the best of common musitians in London Whenever I came to that house (as I did sometimes in those dayes), though not often, to see a play, the musitians would presently play *Whitelocke's Coranto*, and it was so often called for, that they would have it played twice or thrice in an afternoon.²

Though Whitelocke would not have his children think that he was too much of a frequenter of playhouses, it is fairly obvious that he must have been a familiar visitor at Blackfriars if the musicians played his music when he appeared. His tribute to the Blackfriars orchestra indicates another of the distinctions of that theatre; many of the distinguished patrons may have been attracted as much by the music as by the plays.

In the summer of 1634 the King's company was involved in a new sort of squabble, into which we get a hasty glimpse. In the Lord Chamberlain's books is found the following petition.

Players peticoñ
about y^e Witches

A peticoñ of the Kings Players complayning of interminglcing some passages of witches in old playes to y^e p^rudice of their designed Comedy of the Lancashire witches, & desiring a prohibition of any other till theirs bee allowed & Acted Answered p[er] Reference to Blagraue in absence of S^r H. Herbert / July 20. 1634.³

The play of the King's company to which this petition refers is obviously *The Late Lancashire Witches* by Heywood and Brome, which was entered in the Stationers' Register 28 October 1634 and published in the same year as 'lately Acted at the Globe on the Banke-side, by the Kings Majesties Actors'. The phrase in the petition, 'their designed Comedy', as well as the request that other plays be restrained 'till

¹ See below, p. 119.

² 'Whitelocke's labours remembered in the annales of his life, written for the use of his children, MS.' from Burney, *Music*, II. 299.

³ *M.S.C.* II. 410.

theirs bee allowed & Acted', clearly indicates that *The Late Lancashire Witches* was not yet finished. Professor Clark's contention that the epilogue to the play must have been written before 30 June or early July¹ cannot, therefore, be allowed.²

Brome and Heywood's play is based upon the Pendle Forest witch scare and the examination of Margaret Robinson, Frances Dicconson, Mary Spencer, and Mrs Hargreaves in London. The affair attracted much attention in London, and one writer points out that after the alleged witches were brought to town '*great sums [were] gotten at the Fleet to shew them, and publick Plays acted thereupon*'.³ Evidently the King's company was the first to have a play ready and wanted to keep their monopoly while the excitement lasted. Their petition must have been a simple bid for intervention in their favour by the Lord Chamberlain, surely they had no right to such protection.

Whether the rival company was restrained or not, we do not certainly know, but Webster's statement that there was more than one play on the subject of the Lancashire witches implies that there was no restraint or at any rate that the King's men's monopoly did not last. Furthermore, there is an entry in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book which suggests that the King's men overreached themselves.

An ould play, with some new scenes, Doctor Lambe and the Witches, to Salisbury Court, the 16th August, 1634,—£1. 0. 0.⁴

Now one of the owners of the Salisbury Court theatre was William Blagrave, who was paid in January 1634/5 for plays presented at court in 1631⁵ by the Revels company (the company which occupied the Salisbury Court in July 1634 and presumably for two years thereafter).⁶ It will be remembered that the Lord Chamberlain referred the petition of the King's company to Blagrave, who was also Deputy Master of the Revels. It seems probable that the old play with new witch scenes to which the King's men objected was the King's Revels play of *Doctor Lambe and the Witches*, a play which

¹ Clarke, *Heywood*, p. 125.

² Unless the Lord Chamberlain had had the petition for three or four weeks before he turned it over to Blagrave.

³ John Webster, *The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft* (1677), p. 346, noted by Clark, *Heywood*, p. 125.

⁴ Herbert, p. 36.

⁵ See William Blagrave.

⁶ See below, pp. 293 ff.

Blagrave would be anxious for his company to present before the witch scare had subsided. If these suggested identifications are correct, the Lord Chamberlain referred the King's petition to the very man who had most reason for rejecting it. No doubt the King's men failed to enjoy the irony of this situation.

A few months later an episode in one of the notorious quarrels of the time took place in the Blackfriars theatre. Sir John Suckling, who had been a suitor for the hand of the daughter of Sir Henry Willoughby, had attempted to press his suit, with the aid of the King, to the distress of the young lady. For this offence he was cudgelled by another suitor, a younger brother to Sir Kenelm Digby.¹ This encounter took place on the road outside London, but there seems to have been a second encounter, for on the 25th of November, two weeks later, Robert Leake wrote to Sir Gervas Clifton, who was concerned in Suckling's suit,² as follows:

I make no doubt but you have heard that *actus secundus* plaid on Tusday last at Blackfriars between Sir John Suckling and Mr Digby, both of them with their companyes was committed to the King's Bench, but surely Sir John was bayld for I saw him this day in a coach I shall not be so bold to trouble you with the severall relacons in the towne of their affray.³

Courtly encounters of this sort must have given the King's men serious competition from the audience in their own theatre, yet the presence of men like Suckling and his enemies in the audience helped make Blackfriars the resort of 'silkes and plush, and all the witts', as Alexander Gill styled it in his verses on Jonson's *Magnetic Lady*.⁴

Such an audience made Blackfriars and the King's com-

¹ See Garrard's account of the affair in his letter to Wentworth, 10 November 1634, *Strafforde's Letters*, I 336-7.

² See his correspondence, *Hist MSS Com*, Reports on MSS in Various Collections, vol. vii Additional MSS. of Sir Hervey Bruce, pp. 406-9.

³ *Hist MSS. Com*, Reports on MSS in Various Collections, vol vii: Additional MSS of Sir Hervey Bruce, p. 408. There is another reference to this encounter in a letter from Ambrose Randolph to Lady Jane Bacon. 'Here at home Sir John Suckling, in place of repairing his honor, hath lost his reputation for ever, and drawne himself in danger of the law On Tuesday last he waie layed Mr Digby, that had formerly strook him, and, as he came from the play, he, with many more, set upon Mr Digby, in which quarell Sir John Suckling had a man rune through, som say he is dead' The letter is dated '21 of Novembr', and the editor has added in brackets 1628. Obviously the correct date is 1634. ([Richard Griffin Braybrooke, ed.] *The Private Correspondence of Lady Jane Cornwallis, 1613-1644* [London, 1842], p. 197)

⁴ Wood's *Athenae*, II. 598.

pany a very profitable enterprise. Just how profitable it was at this time, we learn from a statement of the income of three of the King's players in the year 1634-5. John Shank and Cuthbert Burbage agree in separate statements that between Whitsun 1634 and Whitsun 1635 Robert Benfield, Eyllaerdt Swanston, and Thomas Pollard each received £180 as members of the company; this sum was exclusive of housekeepers' shares. As Burbage pointed out, such an income would very well keep an actor from starving.

This record of the emolument of members of the King's company is derived from a set of papers which reveal serious dissensions in the organization in 1635, dissensions which led to aggrieved petitions to the Lord Chamberlain. Answers followed petitions, and both, with the subsequent decisions, were copied into the Lord Chamberlain's books, where they were discovered by Halliwell-Phillipps.¹

These interesting and important documents, generally called the Sharers' Papers, reveal the sad fact that at least three of the players had discovered that they were the slaves of the capitalists. The three were simply asking that more of the profits of the company should go to the workers and less to the investors. The sharers could not see the justice of this request. From the appeals in the resulting dispute we get a great deal of information about the King's company.

The papers consist of: (1) A petition of three of the players, Robert Benfield, 'Heliard' Swanston, and Thomas Pollard, to the Lord Chamberlain, undated. (2) Their further petition, undated. (3) The answer of John Shank, another player, but also a chief housekeeper at both the Blackfriars and the Globe; undated. (4) The joint answer of Cuthbert Burbage, his son William, and his sister-in-law Winifred Robinson, formerly wife of Richard Burbage, all sharers in the two theatres, undated. (5) The decision of the Lord Chamberlain on the petitions and answers, dated at Theobalds, 12 July 1635. (6) The summary of a petition of John Shank concerning the enforcement of this decision; undated, but attached to (7) The appointment by the Lord Chamberlain of three arbiters for a final settlement, dated 1 August 1635.² I think

¹ Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, I 312-19. A more accurate transcript is printed *M.S.C.* II 362-73.

² The order given here is not that in which Halliwell-Phillipps gave the papers and in which they are printed from the L.C. petition and warrant book by the Malone Society (*M.S.C.* II 362-73), but the obvious chronological order as pointed out by Fleay (*Fleay, Stage*, pp. 324-5).

the facts we learn from this controversy can best be set forth by a summary of the documents.

(1) and (2) The three players say that 'the pet^{rs} haue a long time with much patience expected to bee admitted Sharers in y^e Play houses of the Globe and the Blackfriars; wherby they might reape some better fruit of their labours then hitherto they haue done, & bee incouraged to proceed therein wth cheerfulness'.¹ However, they have been disappointed. The actors get only the receipts at the outer doors and half the receipts from the galleries and the boxes. From this sum they must pay the wages of the hired men and boys, the cost of lights, music, and other theatre expenses. They say this outlay amounts to about three pounds a day or £900 or £1,000 a year, exclusive of charges for poets and costumes.² In contrast to the actors, the housekeepers get half the takings from the galleries and boxes and all the receipts from the tiring-house door at the Globe.³ From their share the housekeepers must pay only repairs and rent (the actors say the rent for both theatres is not above £65; Shank says £100). Even this charge is partially met by subletting the taphouse, tenement, and garden adjoining the Globe at twenty or thirty pounds a year. Moreover, the actors' share must be divided among nine men and that of the housekeepers among only six, so that 'when some of the Houskeepers share the 12^s a day at y^e Globe the Actors share not aboue 3^s'.⁴ The players explain that the division of the sixteen Globe shares and the eight Blackfriars shares is as follows:⁵

		<i>Globe</i>	<i>Blackfriars</i>
Cuthbert Burbage		3½	1
Mrs (Burbage) Robinson		3½	1
Mrs Condell		2	1
John Shank		3	2
Joseph Taylor		2	1
John Lowin		2	1
Underwood ⁶			1

They admit that Lowin and Taylor deserve their shares, but contend that Shank got his three Globe shares by purchasing them 'surreptitiously' from William Heminges. In

¹ *M S C* n. 362

² *Ibid.*, pp. 365-6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 365. The statement about the Globe doors is ambiguous, but apparently the actors got all the receipts at the outer doors and the housekeepers all the receipts at the tiring-house door.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 366

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 364.

⁶ John Underwood died in 1624 or 1625 (see Appendix, p. 651). The players must refer here to his children, to whom he bequeathed his shares.

conclusion, the actors request that the Lord Chamberlain order Shank, Cuthbert Burbage, and the Robinsons¹ each to sell them one share in the Globe and order Shank to sell them one in the Blackfriars to be divided among the three. This allotment they think only just, so that others should not 'reape most or the chieffest benefitt of the sweat of their browes, & liue vpon the bread of their Labours'²

(3) In his answer, John Shank, 'an old man in this quality', says that he got his shares by purchasing them from William Heminges, as anyone else might have done. He says that two years before, he paid £156 for one share in the Blackfriars with six years to run and one share in the Globe with two years to run. The former was subject to a rent of £6. 5s. per year. Eleven months before, he paid William Heminges £350 for one more share for five years in the Blackfriars and two more shares for one year in the Globe. William Heminges had held the shares without molestation for four years after his father's death. The term of the Globe leases was later extended nine years because of the company's charge of £1,400 in building the second Globe. The petitioners, according to Shank, have each received £180 for their efforts in the company in the past year, besides £34 which Swanston had for a one-third share in the Blackfriars. (The petitioners did not mention this fact.) The yearly rent paid by the lessees of the Globe and Blackfriars is £100 besides repairs. Shank recounts that he has supplied the company with apprentices—Thomas Pollard and John Thompson, deceased (who cost him £40); that since coming to the company he has paid his part of £200 for other boys—John Honyman, Thomas Holcomb, and others; and that he now maintains three boys for the company's service. In final protest to the Lord Chamberlain, Shank

doth conceaue that if the pet^{rs} by those their violent courses may obtaine their desires y^e Lo^d will neuer bee at quiet for their dayly complaintes & it will bee such a p^rsident to all young men that shall follow heerafter, that they shall allwayes refuse to doe his Ma^{ty} service, vnless they may haue whatsoeuer they will though it bee other mens estates³

¹ Sometimes the petitioners refer to Mrs Robinson alone as owner of the Globe and Blackfriars shares, sometimes to Mrs. Robinson and her husband Richard Robinson, an actor in the company.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 364.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 369-70.

(4) The Burbages' answer is much the same as Shank's, except that it is prefaced by an interesting account of the early affairs of the company, telling how 'to or selues wee ioyned those deseruing men, Shakspeare Hemings, Condall, Philips and others partners in y^e profittes of that they call the House'.¹ According to the Burbages, in all these matters 'it is onely wee that suffer continually'.²

(5) After considering the petitions and answers, the Lord Chamberlain ordered, 12 July 1635, that the petitioners be allowed to purchase the shares they desired

at the vsuall & accustomed rates & according to y^e proportion of the time & benefitt they are to inioy And heerof I Desire the Housekeep[er]s & all others whome it may concerne to take notice & to conforme themselues therin accordingly The which if they or any of them refuse or delay to performe, if they are Actors & his Ma^{tes} seruantes I doe suspend them from the Stage & all the benefitt therof & if they are onely interested in y^e Houses, I desire my L^d priuy seale to take order that they may bee left out of the lease, which is to bee made vpon the decree in y^e Court of Requestes.³

The matter was not quite so simply settled as the Lord Chamberlain expected, for, though we hear nothing more of the other capitalists, Shank submitted another petition.

(6) In his final petition, Shank says that he has made an offer to his fellows as the Lord Chamberlain directed, 'but they not onely refused to giue satisfaccōn but restrained him from the Stage'.⁴ In this difficult situation the Lord Chamberlain issued another order.

(7) On 1 August 1635 the Lord Chamberlain appointed Sir Henry Herbert, Sir John Finett, and Daniel Bedingfield to examine all the petitions and answers, interview the several parties concerned, set a fair price on Shank's two shares for Benfield, Pollard, and Swanston, ' & to cause a finall agreem^t & conuayances to bee settled accordingly & to giue mee an account of their whole proceedinges in writing'.⁵

The Sharers' Papers tell us nothing further. If the referees accomplished their work, it was only after a long delay, for in Shank's will of 30 December 1635, which I have found at Somerset House, he left to his wife Winifred the three shares in the Globe and the two in the Blackfriars which he had bought from Heminges. But the old man had not recovered

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 371. I omit the discussion of the earlier history of the company as not pertinent here.

² *Ibid.*, p. 372.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 372-3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 365.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 373.

from the fear and distrust which Benfield and the others had roused in him. He warned his wife lest the shares be 'apprized att an vnder value' and begged 'my fellows his Ma^{ties}: Servants the players that they doe not abridge my said wife, and Executrix in the receiving of what is due vnto me . . . and that they will not goe about to hinder my wife in having her assurance amongst them for my parts in the Globe Play-house' ¹

Quarrels like this between the younger players and the house-keepers did the company no good. Perhaps it was the fault of Shank, who had been too long upon the stage. At all events, the petitions imply that the animosity of the young men is directed chiefly against Shank, and he did not have long to trouble them. His death² may have been a boon to the players.

One would expect these dissensions to have had an ill effect on the company, yet the records which have come down to us give no hint of any decline in their fortunes. In fact, the occasional references to the character of their patrons seem to indicate quite the contrary. On 19 May 1635 Mr. Garrard wrote to the Lord Deputy in Ireland about an affray in the private theatre of the King's men which must have caused no small amount of talk.

The Quarrel that lately broke out betwixt my Lord *Digby* and *Will Crofts* in the *Black-Fryars* at a Play, stands as it did when your Brother went hence. *Crofts* stands confined to his Father's House, because by striking he broke his Bonds of 5000*l.* but there was a great Difference in the Parties that stood bound; my Lord *Bedford* and Sir *John Strangwick* stipulated for my Lord *Digby*, *Tom Eliot* and *Jack Crofts*, Men of small Fortunes for the other, that they should keep the Peace, during the Suit depending in the *Star-Chamber*, the Lords have heard it, and reported their Opinions to the King, and there it rests ³

In 1635 Sir Humphrey Mildmay recorded five visits to the Blackfriars theatre, on 25 April, 28 April, 6 May, 25 November, and 16 December.⁴ The play on the 25th of April was

¹ See Appendix, pp. 646 and 647.

² He was buried at St. Giles' Cripplegate, 27 January 1635/6.

³ *Strafforde's Letters*, 1. 426. The courtly character of the audience at Blackfriars is again indicated in a letter of Viscount Conway to Wentworth, 14 November 1635. 'The Affairs of this Summer make more Noise Abroad than at Home. The Gallants of the Court are more impatient to hear the News of a Battle, than they are to have a Play begin at Black-Fryars' (*ibid.*, p. 478).

⁴ See Appendix, pp. 677-8.

Beaumont and Fletcher's *Elder Brother* and on the 6th of May *Othello*, which Sir Humphrey calls *The Moor of Venice*. The others are not named, though the one which was performed on the 25th of November is called 'a fooleishe play'. Probably two or three of the other plays which Sir Humphrey saw in 1635 were performed by the King's men, since the Blackfriars was his favourite theatre, but he mentions neither theatre nor company for them.

It has several times been asserted that there was a plague closing in 1635, but I find no evidence for such a closing and quite a little evidence that the theatres remained open throughout the year.¹

Early in the following year there was another quarrel at the Blackfriars, among patrons even more prominent than Lord Digby and Will Crofts. On 25 January 1635/6 George Garrard wrote:

A little Pique happened betwixt the Duke of *Lenox* and the Lord Chamberlain about a Box at a new Play in the *Black Fryars*, of which the Duke had got the Key: Which if it had come to be debated betwixt them, as it was once intended, some Heat or perhaps other Inconvenience might have happen'd. His Majesty hearing of it, sent the Earl of *Holland* to commend them both not to dispute it, but before him, so he heard it and made them Friends.²

About this time,³ Charles, Prince of the Palatinate, wrote to his mother, the Queen of Bohemia, that 'his [Van Dyke's] howse is close by Blake Friers, where the Quene saw Lodowick Carlile's second part of Arviragus and Felcia acted, w^{ch} is hugely liked of every one'.⁴ If people of the rank of Pembroke and Lennox were quarrelling about the right to see their plays and the Queen herself was patronizing their theatre,⁵ the King's company is not likely to have been

¹ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 659-61.

² *Sirafforde's Letters*, 1 511.

³ The letter is undated, but Charles was in England November 1635 to June 1637, and the theatres were closed from 12 May 1636 to 2 October 1637, except for one week.

⁴ *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Northumberland MSS., App. to the Third Report, p. 118, No. 132, quoted in *Plays and Masques*, p. 254.

⁵ This visit of the Queen to Blackfriars was not unique. She had been there once before, in May 1634 (see above, p. 39), and the players' bill for 1636 mentions another occasion: 'The 5th: of May at the Blackfryers for the Queene and the prince Elector . . . Alfonso' (*Herbert*, p. 75). The bill of 1638 gives a fourth occasion: 'At the blackfryers the 23 of Aprill for the queene . . . the vnfortunate lou[ers]' (*ibid.*, p. 76).

These performances were probably not public but private ones. Har-

declining in popularity, whatever the differences about shares in their playhouses.

But evil days were again in store for the players. On 10 May 1636 the Privy Council decided that the theatres must be closed because of plague, and on the 12th Sir Henry Herbert sent his closing orders to the companies. Though the plague in 1636 was not so severe as it had been in 1625, it was the most protracted visitation since 1610. For nearly seventeen months the theatres were closed except for a respite of about a week after 24 February 1636/7.¹

Of course the players suffered during this long visitation. The King's men, however, must have been far better provided for than most. Five days after the prohibition of 12 May 1636, a warrant was issued as follows:

Wheras W^m Pen, Thomas Hobbes, W^m Trig,
Players Passe / W^m Patrick Rich^d Baxter, Alexander Gough
W^m Hart & Rich^d Hanley together wth Tenne
more or therabouts of their fellowes his Ma^{tes} Comaediens & of
the peculiar Company of Players in the Blackfryers London, are
comaunded to attend his Ma^{ty}, and bee nigh about the Court this
sofmer Progresse, in readines when they shall bee called vpon to
act before his Ma^{ty} for the better inabling & incouraging them
wherunto His Ma^{ty} is graciously pleased that they shall aswell
before his Ma^{tes} setting forth on his maine Progresse, as in all that
time & after, till they shall haue occasion to retourne homewardes,
haue all freedome & liberty to repayre vnto all Townes Corporate,
mercate Townes & other, where they shall thinke fitt & there in
their Comon Halles, moothalles, schoole houses or other convenient
roomes Act Playes Comaedyes & interludes, w^{thout} any lett,
hinderance or molestation whatsoever (behaueing them selues
cruilly). Wherin it is his Ma^{tes} pleasure, and hee doth expect that
in all places where they come, they bee treated & intertained wth
such due respect & courtesie, as may become his Ma^{ts} loyall &
loueing subjectes towardes his seruantes In testimony wherof
I haue heerunto sett my hand & seale at Armes. Dated at White-
hall the 17th day of May 1636.²

bage's argument (*Cavalier Drama*, p. 19) that the Queen attended regular public performances at Blackfriars is not very convincing, for a masque at the Middle Temple was not at all analogous to a regular performance of a play in a theatre open to the general public. Furthermore, we have evidence that the performances which the Queen attended at Blackfriars in May 1636 and in April 1638 were private and not public ones, for the company was paid as for court performances (see below, pp. 98 and 99).

¹ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 661-5.

² *M S C.* ii. 378-9. That at least four of these men were attendants and not important actors is shown by a ticket of privilege (*ibid.*, p. 380) issued eight months later, which calls four men named in the pass—Patrick,

Evidently it was intended in May that the King's men should accompany the court on the summer progress, but I can find no evidence that they actually did so. In fact, when one considers the fear of the plague which kept the King scurrying from Hampton Court, to Theobalds, to Oatlands, to Royston, to Bagshot, to Salisbury, to Bradford, to Oxford, to Southampton,¹ in the summer of 1636, it seems highly probable that the plans to have the players accompany the court were cancelled because of fear of infection.

Miss Boswell has pointed out² that the list of names in the warrant of 17 May 1636 is a curious one, including several men who were listed as mere attendants of the company in January 1636/7 and excluding all the important members. It seems probable to me that the company intended to carry its patent on the road and that the warrant of 12 May 1636 was required as authorization for those actors who would be needed for performances but who were not named in the patent. It will be noted that the warrant mentioned eight players by name and authorized the presence of 'Tenne more

Baxter (Bagstare), Hart, and Hawley (Hanley, Halley)—dependants on the players

Players preuledgt

Bagstare

Halley

Hart

Patrick

Pettingham

Bowers

Dowle

Bacon

Collins

John Allington

W^m Styles.

Vpon a peticon [sic] of these seuerall persons Dependantes on the Players (vizt) Rich^d Bagstare, Rich^d Halley W^m Hart William Patrick, Henry Pettingham, Rich^d Bowers, Rowland Dowle Iohn Bacon & Edward Collins his Lo^p graunted them seuerall Ticketes of preuiledge in haec verba, mutatis tantū nominib⁹.

Wheras the Bearer heerof Rich^d Bagstare hath beene & is employed by his Mates seruantes the Players of the Blackfryers & is of special vse vnto them both on the Stage & otherwise for his Mates Disport & service, for which cause it is his Mates pleasure that hee bee freed from' all vnecessary trouble or molestation by Arrest or otherwise wherby

Hee may bee wthdrawne from the Company & they disabled to performe their service. Theis are therefore to pray & require all those whome it may concerne to forbear to arrest or otherwise to molest or detaine the body of the sayd Rich^d Bagstare wthout my leaue first asked & obtained for the same: And if there bee any man that shall haue iust cause to Demand it consideration shall bee had of his Comptt.

Hampt Court 12. of Ian 1636

Et sic de caeteris singulatim.

To all Mayors &c

This document is similar to the one issued to attendants of the company in 1624 (see above, pp. 15-16) which contains nearly twice as many names. Only William Patrick is found in both lists.

¹ See *C.S.P., Dom*, 1635-6 and 1636-7, *passim*, and *C.S.P., Ven*, 1636-9, *passim*.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 379.

or thereabouts of their fellowes his Ma^{tes} Comaediens'. Eighteen would be a fair number for a road troupe—about half the number known to have been affiliated with the company in London in 1625.¹

Though it appears, then, that the members of the King's company were disappointed of their hope of accompanying the court on the progress of the summer of 1636, the company received some royal help by means of the payment for the large number of plays which they presented at court in 1636 and the first six or seven weeks of 1637. Their bill shows that they presented twenty-two plays, an unusually large number.

This bill, apparently the one actually presented by the players or a copy of it, is extant and gives a detailed list of performances at court.

Playes acted before the kinge and Queene
this present yeare of the lord 1636.

- 1 Easter munday at the Cockpitt the first parte of Arviragus
- 2 Easter tuesday at the Cockpitt the second parte of Arviragus
- 3 The 21th of Aprill at the Cockpitt the silent woman.
- 4 The 5th of May at the Blackfryers for the Queene } Alfonso²
and the prince Elector

-
- 5 The 17th of November at Hampton Courte . the Coxcombe
 - 6 The 19th of November at Hampton Court . beggers bush
 - 7 The 29th of November at Hampton Court . the maides tragedie.
 - 8 The 6th of December at Hampton Court the loyall subject.
 - 9 The 8th of December at Hampton Court the moore of Venice.
 - 10 The 16th of December at Hampton Court loues pilgrimage
 - 11 [The *del*] S^t Stephens day at Hampton Court the first pte of
Arviragus
 - 12 S^t Johns Day at Hampton Court the second parte of Arviragus.
 - 13 The first day of January at Hampton Court . loue and honor.
 - 14 The 5th of January at Hampton Court the Elder brother
 - 15 The 10th of January at Hampton Court the kinge and noe
kinge.
 - 16 The 12th of January the new play from Oxford . the Royall
slave.
 - 17 The 17th of January at Hampton Court——Rollo
 - 18 The 24th of January at Hampton Court——hamlett.

-
- 19 The 31th of January at S^t James . the tragedie of Cesar.

¹ See above, pp 15-18

² The play was evidently selected for the Prince. Professor Parrott (*Chapman Tragedies*, pp. 690-2) even suggests that it may have been revised for performance before him.

- 20 The 9th of february at St James . the wife for a moneth
 21 The 16th of february at St James the Governour
 22 The 21th of february at St James Philaster.

22 : playes.¹

The £240 which the King's men received in March 1636/7 for these plays given when other companies were idle must have been a great help for men to whom plague meant poverty

One of the performances listed in the players' bill, *The Royal Slave* on the 12th of January, was an attempt to duplicate one which the King and Queen had seen at Oxford a few months before. The players must have been put upon their mettle, for, as Wood writes,

the Queen sent to the Chancellor that he would procure of Christ Church the Persian attire of the Royall Slave and other apparell wherein it was acted, to the end that she might see her own Players² act it over again, and whether they could do it as well as was done by the University. Whereupon the Chancellor caused the Cloaths and Perspectives of the Stage to be sent to Hampton Court in a Waggon, for which the University received from her a letter of thanks. So that all of it being fitted for use (the author thereof being then present) 'twas acted soon after, but by all mens confession, the Players came short of the University Actors. At the same time the Chancellor desired of the King and Queen that neither the Play, or Cloathes, nor Stage, might come into the hands and use of the Common Players abroad, which was graciously granted.³

The provision that the actors were not to have the costumes or sets seems to have been rather widely known, for Mr. E[dward] R[ossingham] wrote of the same stipulations to Sir Thomas Puckering.⁴ No doubt the costumes would have been very useful to the players, but—unless our notion of staging in the public theatres is all wrong—they could not have used the settings, for the Oxford production had been a very elaborate one. Wood says:

¹ Law, *Forgeries*, p. 39

² Sir Edmund Chambers has called my attention to the fact that 'her own Players' is an odd way to refer to the King's men who produced the play at court. He queries, 'Does this mean only the four Queen's men who joined the King's?' I suppose it might, but I should think it more likely to be a careless reference of Wood's. Or perhaps the Queen had intended to have her company produce the play when she wrote, but for some unknown reason—such as the dissolution of the company—had turned it over to the King's men

³ Wood, *Hist. & Antiq. Oxon.* II, Book I, 412-13.

⁴ Burch, *Charles I*, II. 266.

Within the shuts were seen a curious Temple, and the Sun shining over it, delightful forests also, and other prospects Within the great shuts mentioned before, were seen villages, and men visibly appearing in them, going up and down, here and there, about their business The Interludes thereof were represented with as much variety of scenes and motions as the great wit of Imgo Jones (well skilled in setting out a Court Maske to the best advantage) could extend to ¹

There was further help for the King's players On 13 December 1636 a warrant was issued which recorded that

the King having commanded his servants the players to assemble their company and keep themselves together near the Court, gives them an allowance of 20*l* per week, which is to be paid to John Lowen and Joseph Taylor, on behalf of their company, such allowance to commence from the 1st November last, to continue during his Majesty's pleasure, and to be taken as of his princely bounty ²

Back payment amounted to £120, and if the allowance continued only as long as the players were at Hampton Court—where the warrant was issued and where they were probably playing at the time³—they were entitled to £120 more.

There must have been some further relief for the plague-ridden company in the livery allowance which was made to sixteen members on 22 April 1637,⁴ though the grant was not made as a relief measure but was, in the words of the warrant, 'an ancient accustomed Allowance euery second yeere & due at Easter last'.

A few pages further on in the same Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book which contains the record of the livery allowance⁵ is found another entry concerning the King's players. Under date of 10 June 1637 is a copy of a letter from the Lord Chamberlain to the Masters and Wardens of the Company of Printers and Stationers. After noting that his predecessor, the Earl of Pembroke, had on a previous occasion written the Stationers notifying them of a complaint by

¹ Wood, *Hist & Antiq Oxon* II, Book I, 411-12 There are other indications that the performance at court was a very elaborate one The King's men were paid £30 for their performance instead of the usual £20 (*M.S.C.* II 382), the author was given a reward of £40 (*Herbert*, p 57), and the property makers, scene painters, and dancers were paid £154 (*M.S.C.* II 382-3).

² *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1636-7, p 228 This document is to be found in a different form in the Signet Office Docquet Book under date of December 1636 (*C 82/2149*).

³ See below, p. 98.

⁴ *M.S.C.* II. 383.

⁵ *L.C.* 5/134.

the King's company against corrupt printing of their plays and forbidding the printing of any more of the King's men's plays without the players' consent, the Lord Chamberlain goes on to say,

Notwithstanding which I am informed that some Coppyes of Playes belonging to y^e King & Queenes servantes the Players, & purchased by them at Deare rates, haueing beene lately stollen or gotten from them by indirect meanes are now attempted to bee printed & that some of them are at y^e Presse & ready to bee printed, which if it should bee suffered, would directly tend to their apparent Detriment & great p^ruidice & to the disenabling of them to doe their Ma^{tes} service ffor prevention & redresse wherof it is desired that Order bee guen & entred by the M^r & Wardens of the Company of Printers & Stationers, that if any Playes bee already entred, or shall heerafter bee brought vnto the Hall to bee entred for printing, that notice therof bee guen to the Kinges & Queenes servantes the Players, & an inquiry made of them to whome they doe belong, And that none bee suffered to bee printed vntill the assent of their Ma^{tes} sayd servantes bee made appeare to y^e M^r & Wardens of the Company of Printers & Stationers by some Certificate in writeing vnder the handes of Iohn Lowen & Ioseph Taylor for the Kings servantes & of Christopher Bieston for y^e Kings & Queenes young Company, or of such other persons, as shall from time to time haue the direcōn of those companyes, which is a course that can bee hurtfull vnto none, but such as goe about vniustly to p^rvayle themselves of others goodes without respect of Order or good gouⁿment which I confident [*sic*] you will bee carefull to auoyd, And therefore I comfend it to y^r speciall care & if you shall haue need of any further Authority or power either from his Ma^{tye} or the counsell table, the better to inable you in y^e execution therof, vpon notice giuen to mee either by y^r selues or by the Players I will endeaouour to apply that further remedye therto w^{ch} shall bee requisite. And soe I bidd you very hartly farewell & rest

y^r very loueing friend.

P & M ¹

Iune 10. 1637

This letter is rather ambiguous in its reference to the players. The Lord Chamberlain's statement that the complaint had come from 'y^e King & Queenes servantes the Players' might refer to Beeston's Boys, or it might refer to both that company and the King's men.² The mention of

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 384-5

² Possibly the entry in *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1637, p. 170 (No. 155) gives us an earlier record of this complaint. 'List of petitions "left" by [Sir William Becher, clerk of the Council,] "at the chamber, indispatched," at the close of his month of attendance. Among them is "the Players' petition to his

Lowin and Taylor would indicate that the King's players were involved, but it may be that the Lord Chamberlain merely took the occasion of Beeston's complaint to protect the plays of the King's company as well. Beeston might well have been trying to protect the plays he claimed against the reorganized Queen Henrietta's company, an organization which certainly might have claimed rights in plays which they had once produced but which were later performed as their own by Beeston's Boys. In either case we have another example of the Lord Chamberlain's intercession in behalf of the King's company.¹

By September 1637 the theatres had been closed for nearly sixteen months, and the players must have been nearing desperation. At the meeting of 3 September 1637 the Council received a petition from the company that they be allowed to play at Michaelmas,² and at the meeting of the 17th permission was granted:

Order of the King in Council. His Majesty's servants, the players, having been for a long time restrained, and having spent what they got in many years before, and having prayed that they might now be at liberty to use their quality, it is ordered as in the article preceding [i.e., in the answer to Christopher Beeston's similar petition, 'that Beeston should be at liberty to practise his actors at Michaelmas next, if there be no considerable increase of the sickness, nor that there die more than died last week']³

It is curious that the players' petition which was noted on 3 September should be copied in the records of the sitting of the 24th, but such is the case. In the records for the sitting of the Council on the latter date the following is found:

His Ma^{ty}s Servants y^e Players having, by reason of the Infec^{ti}on of the Plague in and neare London, been for a long time restrained and having now spent what they got in many yeares before and soe not able any longer to subsist & mainteine their families did

Majesty "" This petition may, however, have been one of the several attempts by the players to have the plague prohibition of playing removed. In any case, we have no clue to the identity of the particular company of players which petitioned

¹ See above, p. 34 and n. 3.

² *C S P., Dom.*, 1637, p. 403 (No. 18). 'Book of notes by Nicholas of proceedings of the Council at their several meetings during this month. . . Petition of the King's players, if there fall nothing between this and Michaelmas, then at Michaelmas they may play, and all the schools'

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 420 and 421 (Nos. 86 and 87).

by their Petiçon to his Ma^{tie}: most humbly desire leave to bee now at libertie to vse their quallity.¹

Probably there was little exaggeration in the players' petition. Sixteen months was a long time for actors to live on their savings—even successful actors assisted by royal bounty.

When Michaelmas came the players were disappointed of their hopes, for, on the day before, the plague tables had shown an increase of five deaths over the preceding week.² Nevertheless, they were allowed to open the theatres three days later, on the 2nd of October,³ after nearly seventeen months of idleness.

It was probably some time during these plague months that several of the leading members of Queen Henrietta's men had joined the King's company. We know that five of the old Queen Henrietta's players—Michael Bowyer, William Robbins, William Allen, Hugh Clark, and Theophilus Bird—were King's men by the end of 1640, for they were made Grooms of the Chamber as King's players on 22 January 1640/1.⁴ We know also that the old Queen's company was broken up by the spring of 1637,⁵ and that three of the more prominent members went to the Salisbury Court, whereupon that company took the Queen's service.⁶ A Chancery suit of 1655 which Mr. Hotson has recently discovered indicates that Bowyer and perhaps some of the others were members

¹ *M.S.C.* i. 394 The wording of this petition seems unduly humble, for the players were asking no more than their rights. The last five weekly reports of plague deaths (five before the 24th, two before the 3rd) had all given totals below the generally accepted danger mark of forty, but still the theatres remained closed. There must have been some concerted action on the part of the players, for petitions by the King's men, the Queen's men, and Beeston's Boys are all recorded in the course of a week (see below, pp. 240 and 328). One wonders if the theatres might have been kept closed as a punishment because the companies had all violated regulations. Beeston's Boys seem to have done so (see below, p. 327), the prologue to Brome's *English Moor* indicates some irregularity of the Queen's men, probably about this time, the petition of the King's men is very humble, and the authorities kept the theatres closed nearly six weeks longer than usual, though the death roll for the first eight months of 1637 had been less than in 1636 and much less than in 1625. At present this possible irregularity on the part of the players can be no more than a conjecture.

² See Appendix, p. 670.

³ 'The plague encreasinge, the players laye still untill the 2 of October, when they had leave to play' (*Herbert*, p. 65). On 9 October 1637 George Garrard wrote to the Lord Deputy in Ireland, 'The Players have obtained Leave to play again . . .' (*Strafforde's Letters*, II. 118). On 3 November 1637 Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw an unnamed play at Blackfriars (see Appendix, p. 678).

⁴ *M.S.C.* II. 397.

⁵ See below, pp. 236-9

⁶ See below, p. 237.

of the King's company shortly after the plague of 1636-7. In this suit¹ Theophilus Bird says that he joined the King's men about 1635, deposited £200 towards the company's stock 'of apparel, books, hangings, and other goods to the value of £3,000 and upwards', and signed a bond in trust for Bowyer, who had come to the King's men before him and advanced £200 to them.

Bird was certainly inaccurate in his date of 1635, for he was still with Beeston and the King and Queen's young company on 12 May 1637.² We must remember that he was writing of affairs twenty years past. The interesting fact here is that Bowyer was an established member when Bird joined. In view of the other facts we have, it seems not unlikely that Allen, Clark, and Robbins had joined about this time also. If Bowyer came to the King's men during or just after the period of plague closing, they would have had good use for the £200 which both parties to the suit admit that he advanced for the company.

The season of plays at court began this year shortly before the theatres reopened on the 2nd of October, for on the 15th of the following March a warrant was directed to Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston for payment for fourteen plays performed at court between 30 September 1637 and 3 February 1637/8.³ Only one of the plays presented in this season is known, and that indirectly. The title-page for the alternative fifth act of Sir John Suckling's *Aglaura*⁴ says, 'Represented At the Court, by his Majesties Servants'. This alternate fifth act was evidently prepared for the court performance of 3 April 1638,⁵ but there had been another performance at court in the preceding Christmas season, for the court prologue to the new fifth act begins,

Tis strange perchance (you'll thinke) that she that d'id
At Christmas, should at Easter be a Bride.⁶

¹ Hotson, pp. 31-4.

² See below, p. 327. Since he is not in the list of King and Queen's players of 10 August 1639, he probably joined between May 1637 and August 1639. Bird may be inaccurate also in stating that he deposited £200 with the company. The defendants say that his deposit was only £50, a sum which tallies with the amount in Shank's will (see Appendix, p. 647). Bird does not deny that £50 was the customary value of a share, but says that he deposited £150 more than the others had.

³ *M.S.C.* ii 387.

⁴ The play was first printed in folio in 1638. It was entered in the Stationers' Register 18 April 1638.

⁵ Herbert, p. 76.

⁶ *Fragmenta Aurea, Aglaura*, 1648 ed., E3.

That the Christmas season referred to was that of 1637-8 is shown by a letter of 7 February 1637/8 from George Garrard to the Earl of Strafford:¹

Two of the King's Servants, Privy-Chamber Men both, have writ each of them a Play, Sir *John Sutilin* and *Will Barclay*, which have been acted in Court, and at the *Black Friars*, with much Applause *Sutilin's* Play cost three or four hundred Pounds setting out, eight or ten Suits of new Cloaths he gave the Players; an unheard of Prodigality¹

Aubrey refers to this gorgeous performance in his account of Suckling:

When his *Aglaura* was <acted>, he bought all the cloathes himselfe, which were very rich, no tinsill, all the lace pure gold and silver, which cost him . . . I have now forgott He had some scaenes to it, which in those dayes were only used at masques²

No doubt these eight or ten splendid suits did good service in a wardrobe which had suffered during seventeen months of plague poverty.³

These elaborate productions which the King's men presented at their private theatre with court costumes and possibly with scenery evidently attracted custom to Blackfriars, for there is much comment upon them.⁴ John Phillips set forth a series of suggested bequests for Fortune in a poem called 'The Impartial Doom'. His request for the actors was,

Lest the Players should grow poor,
Send them Aglauras more and more⁵

But the competitors of the company were evidently jealous, as may be seen from several of the prologues and epilogues of Richard Brome. In the prologue to his *Antipodes*, produced, according to the title-page, by the Queen's company

¹ *Strafforde's Letters*, II 150.

² Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II 244.

³ The experience of fine court clothes was not new to the players, for when they had presented Cartwright's *Royal Slave* the year before on 12 January they had played in the fine Persian costumes sent down from Oxford for them. They had not been allowed to keep these costumes, however (see above, p. 52). In January 1633/4 they had been more fortunate, for Herbert records that on 6 January 1633/4 the King's men presented *The Faithful Shepherdess* at court 'in the clothes the Queene had given Taylor the year before of her owne pastorall' (*Herbert*, p. 53).

⁴ For a discussion of these courtiers' plays and their tradition, see *Cavalier Drama*, pp. 93-124.

⁵ *Sportive Wit*, 1656, p. 40 (F₄^v).

in the same year that the King's men performed *Aglaura*, Brome says:

*Opinion, which our Author cannot court,
(For the deare daintinesse of it) has, of late,
From the old way of Playes possest a Sort
Only to run to those, that carry state
In Scene magnificent and language high,
And Cloathes worth all the rest, except the Action,
And such are only good those Leaders cry,
And into that beleefe draw on a Faction,
That must despise all sportive, merry Wit,
Because some such great Play had none in it*¹

He was somewhat more disdainful when he wrote his verses 'Upon AGLAURA printed in Folio'. After several sneers at this pretentious way of printing plays, the doughty old disciple of Ben Jonson takes a fling at the famous costumes in which the actors of *Aglaura* had been dressed:

*She, that in Persian habit made great brags,
Degenerates in this excesse of rags;
Who, by her Giant-bulk this only gaines,
Perchance in Libraries to hang in chaines.*²

Two or three years later Brome was still indignant when he wrote the prologue to his *Court Beggar*, beginning,

*We've cause to fear yours, or the Poets frowne
For of late day's (he know's not how) y'are grown,
Deeply in love with a new strayne of wit
Which he condemns, at least disliketh it,
And solemnely protests you are to blame
If at his hands you doe expect the same;
Hee'l tread his usuall way, no gaudy Sceane
Shall give instructions, what his plot doth meane,
No handsome Love-toy shall your time beguile
Forcing your pittie to a sigh or smile.*³

And in the epilogue to the same play there was further muttering against the despised courtiers who had contaminated the public taste with their spectacular plays for Blackfriars:

... If it were for one of the great and curious Poets that give these Playes as the Prologue said, and money too, to have 'em acted; For them, indeed, we are bound to ply for an applause. Because

¹ Brome, *Works*, III. [230].

² Prefixed to *The Weeding of the Covent-Garden*, Brome, *Works*, vol. II.

³ *Five New Playes*, 1653, p. N₄^v.

they look for nothing else, and scorn to beg for themselves. But then you'll say those Playes are not given to you, you pay as much for your seats at them as at these, though you sit nere the merrier, nor rise the wiser, they are so above common understanding, and tho' you see for your love you will judge for your money, why so for that too, you may. But take heed you displease not the Ladies tho' who are their partiall judges, being brib'd by flattering verses to commend their Playes; for whose faire cause, and by their powerfull voyces to be cry'd up wits o' Court, the right worshipfull Poets boast to have made those enterludes, when for ought you know they bought 'em of Universitie Scholars tho', and onely shew their own wits in owning other mens, and that but as they are like neither ¹

From the year 1638 to the closing of the theatres our records of the activities of the King's men are more meagre than for the earlier years. We know that they presented twenty-three plays at court and one for the Queen at Blackfriars between 26 March 1638 and 7 January 1638/9. For these plays Lowin and Taylor and Swanston were paid £300 by a warrant of 12 March 1638/9.² The bill which the company presented for its plays given at court in this year is now preserved at Warwick Castle and was first reproduced by Mr George R. Wright in *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* in 1860.³

In the summer of 1638 the company again succumbed to the lure of political comment. Fortune, by some unknown device, saved them from the fruit of their folly. Herbert's office-book gives us an outline of events.

Received of Mr Lowens for my paines about Messinger's play called *The King and the Subject*, 2 June, 1638, 1l o. o.

The name of *The King and the Subject*⁴ is altered, and I allowed the play to bee acted, the reformations most strictly observed, and not otherwise, the 5th of June, 1638.

At Greenwich the 4 of June. Mr. W. Murray, gave mee power

¹ *Five New Playes*, p. S₈.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 388-9

³ More accessible reproductions of this bill are to be found in Adams, p. 404, and *Herbert*, pp 76-7. All the material is listed below, pp. 99-100. For a note on the present location of the original of the bill, see a letter from G. E. Bentley, *T.L.S.*, 7 December 1932, p. 943

⁴ Malone says (*Variorum*, iii 230), 'I suspect it was new named *The Tyrant*. The play is lost' Professor Adams adds (*Herbert*, p 38, n 2), 'A play called *The Tyrant* was entered in S.R. June 29, 1660, but was not printed. In Warburton's list we find "The Tyrant, A Tragedy by Phill Massenger." The MS was advertised in Warburton's sale, November 1759, but I am not able to discover its present owner.'

from the king to allowe of the play, and tould me that hee would warrant it

'Mony's? Wee'le rayse supplies what ways we please,
'And force you to subscribe to blanks, in which
'We'le mulct you as wee shall thinke fitt The Caesars
'In Rome were wise, acknowledginge no lawes
'But what their swords did ratifye, the wives
'And daughters of the senators bowinge to
'Their wills, as deities,' &c.

This is a peece taken out of Phillip Messingers play, called *The King and the Subject*, and entered here for ever to bee remembered by my son and those that cast their eyes on it, in honour of Kinge Charles, my master. who readinge over the play at Newmarket, set his marke upon the place with his owne hande, and in these words.

'This is too insolent, and to bee changed'

Note, that the poett makes it the speech of a king, Don Pedro, king of Spayne, and spoken to his subjects.¹

It is little wonder that there were objections to the lines quoted! Since the play reached the hands of the King himself, the players must have had a friend at court who carried the matter over the head of Sir Henry Herbert, as Endymion Porter had done in the case of Davenant's *Wits* four years before.² This friend may have been Herbert's 'Mr. W. Murray' (William Murray, Gentleman of the Bedchamber, later the first Earl of Dysart, and a person of great influence with the King), but it seems somewhat more likely that Murray was acting for someone else. The wording of Sir Henry's statement about the King's authorization suggests that His Majesty's censorship was much less severe than that of the Master of the Revels had been.

In 1638 Sir Humphrey Mildmay recorded only one visit to a King's theatre. On the 27th of October he saw a revival of Jonson's *Volpone* at Blackfriars.³ This performance was probably in the nature of a dress rehearsal, for the play was performed at court less than two weeks later.⁴

In the following spring, two days after the payment of 12 March 1638/9 for court performances, which has been noted before, a warrant was issued to Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston for liveries for sixteen of the King's players.⁵

Later in the spring of 1639 we have records of two of the plays produced by the company at their theatre, for Sir

¹ *Herbert*, pp. 22-3.

² See *ibid.*, p. 22.

³ See Appendix, p. 678.

⁴ Adams, p. 404.

⁵ *M.S.C.* ii. 389.

Humphrey Mildmay notes in his account book that he went to see Jonson's *Alchemist* on the 18th of May and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Mad Lover* on the 21st.¹ It is interesting to note how many old plays the King's company was producing at this time. More than half those presented at court in 1638 were over five years old, and about one-third of the twenty-four performances were productions of plays which we still think of as Elizabethan classics.

Sir Edmund Chambers has suggested² that the Lord Chamberlain's order of 10 August 1639, requiring other London companies 'not any wayes to intermedle wth or Act' any of the plays belonging to William Beeston and his company,³ may have been prompted by the King's men's production of *Monsieur Thomas*. This play was printed in 1639 as 'Acted at the Private House in Blacke Fryers', but Beeston claimed it in his list under the title, *Fathers owne Sonne*. Though the action of the King's men may have been one of the reasons for Beeston's protest, it seems likely that he was having greater difficulties with Queen Henrietta's men, who, before their reorganization, had performed many of the plays on his list and who probably felt that they had some right to them.

In the last half of 1639 and the first few weeks of 1640 the players produced twenty-one unnamed plays at court. Performances began this year much earlier than usual, for the warrant of 4 April 1640 which directs payment for these plays records that they were 'acted betweene the 6th of August 1639 & the 11th of Febr: following'.⁴

Some time in 1640 (probably in April or May, as the play was entered in the Stationers' Register 2 April 1640, a week before the performance at court)⁵ the King's men produced William Habington's *Cleodora, Queen of Aragon*, which had been so elaborately staged at court by the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery's 'servants out of his own family'.⁶ It is perhaps an evidence of official favour that the Lord Chamber-

¹ See Appendix, p. 678.

² *M.S.C.* 1 364-5

³ *Ibid.*, II 389-90.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 392.

⁵ It is possible that *The Queen of Aragon* was the 'Newe play att Bl: fryers' which Sir Humphrey saw with his guests on 15 May 1640 (see Appendix, p. 679).

⁶ This court performance took place 9 April 1640 (*Herbert*, p. 58). Though the play seems to have been acted first at court, it was also acted at the Blackfriars, for the edition of 1640 contains 'The Prologue at the Fryers' and 'The Epilogue at the Fryers', as well as the prologue and epilogue given at court.

lain allowed his play to be produced privately by this company. Possibly Richard Brome was thinking of the Lord Chamberlain and William Habington when he wrote in the epilogue to *The Court Beggar* of 'great and curious Poets that give these Playes . . . and money too, to have 'em acted . . . the right worshipfull Poets boast to have made those enterludes, when for ought you know they bought 'em of Univerſitie Scholars. . . .'¹ One wonders if the company succeeded also in securing the costumes which had been made for the play, as they did in the similar case of Suckling's *Aglaure*.

About this time James Shirley began to write for the King's company.² Massinger had just recently died,³ and Shirley succeeded him as chief poet to the company, probably under contract to them, for his plays were licensed for the company at regular intervals, one for the spring season and one for the autumn: *Rosania* (printed as *The Doubtful Heir*), 1 June 1640,⁴ *The Impostor* (printed as *The Imposture*), 10 November 1640;⁵ *The Politique Father* (printed as *The Brothers*), 26 May 1641;⁶ *The Cardinal*, 25 November 1641;⁷ *The Sisters*, 26 April 1642.⁸ Probably the play intended for November 1642 was *The Court Secret*, which was not licensed, but was published in 1652 as 'Never Acted, But prepared for the Scene at Black-Friers.'

In 1640 the plague again became alarming. Although the number of deaths from this scourge increased steadily from the 1st of July until the week of 10 September, when the plague fatalities reached 105 and began to decline, it is not until September that we have any evidence that playing was prohibited. The Privy Council ordered the theatres and Paris Garden closed at their meeting of 11 September. We do not know just how long this prohibition lasted, but probably playing was resumed at the end of the first week in November, for only seventeen plague deaths had been reported on the 5th, and we have records of play attendance on the 6th, 9th, and 16th.⁹

¹ See above, pp. 59-60.

² See Nason, pp. 117-33.

³ He was buried at St Saviour's Southwark, 18 March 1639/40 (see Bentley, *T.L.S.*).

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 39. None of these licences names a company, but the plays were all published as acted by the King's men, and most of them have prologues for the Blackfriars.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.* For the identification of the play, see Nason, pp. 47-62.

⁷ *Herbert*, p. 39.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 665-6.

The warrant which authorizes payment for the company's plays at court in the Christmas season of 1640-1 does not give the number, but says merely '160¹ vnto the Kinges Players for Playes Acted before his Mat^{tye} the Queene & Prince betweene the 10th of Nouember. 1640 & the 22th of Febr. 1641'.¹ From this warrant we learn only that the number was not greater than sixteen.

In January 1640/1 six players were sworn Grooms of the Chamber to attend His Majesty in the quality of players. These men were Michael Bowyer, William Robbins, William Allen, Hugh Clarke, Theophilus Bird, and Stephen Ham-merton.² Most of them were old members of Queen Henrietta's company and had probably been King's men for some time before they were sworn Grooms of the Chamber.³

In February following there was a renewal of the old petition of the residents of the parish of Blackfriars against the players. In 1619, 1631, and 1633⁴ there had been petitions from the residents of the parish, but this time the matter was more serious, for the petition was made to the House of Commons, and the Commons in these days were decidedly unsympathetic towards plays and such frivolities. The petition is recorded by Sir Simonds D'Ewes in his Journal for 26 February 1640/1:

Then a petition preferred by the inhabitants of Blacke Friers and others against the play howse ther etc. hinderance of trade, by Alderman Pennington. Hee spake to further it. I etc A good petition Gods howse not soe neare Divils This a particular greivance this and the other a generall. All the objection men without them could not tell how to imploy them themselves etc. Others spake against this playhowse and others.

Then Sir Henry Fane being returned his reporting that the Lords would give us a present meeting brake offe our agitation.⁵

The editor points out in a footnote that the Parliamentary diary of D'Ewes's colleague, John Moore of Liverpool, records that the other parishes concerned with the petition were St. Martin's, Ludgate, and St. Bride's. This petition and the character of its reception are a significant warning of the action of the House against the players eighteen months later.

On the same day on which the players were paid for their

¹ *M S C.* II, 397.

² *Ibid.*

³ See above, pp. 56-7.

⁴ See above, pp. 4-5, 31-4.

⁵ *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, p. 412.

performances at court (20 March 1640/1), the warrant for their biennial liveries was issued. This time liveries were granted to eighteen players, the largest number yet recognized.¹

Plague raged in London in the summer and autumn of 1641. More than forty plague deaths were reported on the 15th of July; and in every week except one in August, September, and October, more than one hundred were reported. Though there is some confusion about the closing and re-opening of the theatres, I think they were closed on the 5th of August and reopened in the last week in November.²

Probably it was shortly before the theatres were closed that the King's company sought protection for their plays. Under date of 7 August 1641 occurs one of the most interesting items which the Lord Chamberlain's office-books furnish us concerning the company. On this day the Earl of Essex, the new Lord Chamberlain, wrote the Masters and Wardens of the Stationers' Company that the King's men had complained to him that some printers were about to publish certain of their plays. Essex required the Stationers to forbid the printing of any play belonging to the King's men without their consent, and continued:

The particulars to which they now lay claime are contained in a List inclosed, and if any of those Playes shall bee offered to y^e Presse vnder another name then is in the List expressed, I shall desire yo^r care that they may not bee defrauded by that meanes but that they may bee made acquainted wth it, before they bee recorded in y^r Hall & soe haue Oportunity to shew their right vnto them. . .

A List of y^e Playes followes

The wild goose chase [col. 1]	The martiall maide
The litle french Lawyer.	Beauty in a Trance
The Loyall subject.	The forc'd Lady
The spanish Curat.	Alexius

¹ M S C. 11 397-8.

² See the Plague Appendix, pp. 666-7. It was during this plague closing of the summer and autumn of 1641 (and not in 1625, as Collier thought [*H E.D.P.* 11 37], or 1640, as Fleay would have it [*Stage* p. 359]) that the interesting pamphlet, 'The Stage-Players Complaint in a pleasant Dialogue betwene Cane of the *Fortune*, and Reed of the *Frers* Deploing their sad and solitary conditions for want of Employment. In this heauey and Contagious time of the Plague in London' appeared (see below, p. 317). The foreboding of the players at this time is apparent in the lines, 'But I'll assure you 'tis to be feared: For Monopolers are downe, Projectors are downe, the High Commission Court is downe, the Starre-Chamber is down, & (some think) Bishops will downe, and why should we then that are farre inferior to any of those not justly feare, least we should be downe too?' (See the reprint in Hazlitt, *Drama and Stage*, p. 256.)

The Custom o'th Cuntry	The vnfortunate Louers
The double marriage	The faire fauorite
A wife for a moneth.	The Emperour Valentinian
The Island Princes	The Goblins
The mad Louer.	The distresses
The Pilgrim	The doubtfull heire
The Maior of Quinborow & [sic]	The Imposture
The womans Plott	The Country Captaine [col. 3]
The womans prize &c	The discontented Colonell
The Swtizar.	The Brothers
More dissemblers beside women	Mineruae's sacrifice
The widow	The Iudge.
The kn ^t of Malta	The Citty madam.
The Nouella	The Corporall.
The lousesick maid	Alfonso Emper ^{or} of Germany
The Captaine	The Nobleman
The numerous Lieuetennt [col. 2]	The bashfull Louer
Bunduca.	Loue & honor.
The inconstant Lady	The 1 st & 2 ^d pt of y ^e Passi ^o n ^t
Chances	louer
The maid of the Mill	The Guardian.
The Bridegroom & y ^e Madmã	The Duke of Lerma or y ^e spanish
The Queene of Corinth	Duke.
The Coxcombe	The Prophetesse
The noble gentleman	The Louers Pilgrimage
Beggars	The Louers Progresse
The honest mans fortune	News from Plimouth. ¹

These plays evidently formed a part, by no means all, of the repertory of the King's company in the summer of 1641. Since the list was prepared for the guidance of the Stationers' Company, it mentions none of the company's plays which had already been printed—notably the plays of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher. A number of other plays which the company owned, or at any rate had performed in the past twenty-five years, are omitted for one reason or another. The whole known repertory of the company in our period, which has been presented elsewhere,² contains about three times as many plays as the Lord Chamberlain's list; unknown and unassigned plays would probably swell the total to at least two hundred. This impressive list

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 398-9.

² See below, pp. 107-34. For very interesting discussions of the fate of these plays after the closing of the theatres, see W. W. Greg, 'The Bakings of Betsy', *The Library*, July 1911; E. K. Chambers, 'Plays of the King's Men in 1641', *M.S.C.* i. 364-7; and Allardyce Nicoll, 'The Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in Elizabethan Plays', *R.E.S.* i. 84-91.

of Elizabethan plays is another of the many indications of the almost unchallenged supremacy of the King's men over other dramatic companies during the last twenty-five years of the Elizabethan theatre.

Unfortunately the competition of other troupes of actors was not the most serious threat to the existence of the King's men in the last years before the war. Omens of evil days to come are only too apparent in Herbert's single entry concerning the plays at court in the Christmas season of this year.

On Twelfth Night, 1641-[1642], the prince had a play called *The Scornful Lady*,¹ at the Cockpitt, but the kinge and queene were not there, and it was the only play acted at court in the whole Christmas.²

The fear of the plague never left London these days. Though we have noted above that the deaths decreased in the winter, it had been nearly two years since there had been a week entirely free of plague deaths. The number seldom dropped below fifteen in 1642. At the same time the Puritan feeling against the players was growing. *The True Diurnal Occurrences* records that on Friday, 4 February 1641/2, 'there was a great complaint made against the Play-houses, and a motion made for the suppressing of them'.³ It is partly for these reasons that we hear little of the King's men in the last year before the war. The last official record of their activities is to be found in Sir Henry Herbert's licence to them of Shirley's comedy, *The Sisters*, on 26 April 1642.⁴ The prologue to this play makes quite clear the melancholy outlook for the players and shows that plague and Puritan antagonism did not make up the sum of their troubles.

Does this look like a Term? I cannot tell,
Our Poet thinks the whole Town is not well,
Has took some Physick lately, and for fear
Of catching cold dares not salute this Ayr.
But ther's another reason, I hear say
London is gone to *York*, 'tis a great way;
Pox o'the Proverb, and of him say I,
That look'd ore *Lincoln*, cause that *was*, must we

¹ Published in 1625 and later as a King's play.

² *Herbert*, p. 58.

³ Quoted Hotson, p. 5.

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 39. Known as a King's play from the 1652 title-page and the references to the Blackfriars and to King's dramatists in the prologue.

Be now translated North? I could rail to
 On Gammar *Shupions* Ghost, but 't wo'not doe,
 The Town will still be *flecking*, and a Play
 Though ne'r so new, will starve the second day.
 Upon these very hard conditions,
 Our Poet will not purchase many Towns,
 And if you leave us too, we cannot thrive,
 I'll promise neither Play nor Poet live
 Till ye come back, think what you do, you see
 What audience we have, what Company
 „*To Shakespear comes, whose mirth did once beguile*
 „*Dull hours, and buskind, made even sorrow smile,*
 „*So lovely were the wounds, that men would say*
 „*They could endure the bleeding a whole day:*
 He has but few friends lately, think o' that,
 Hee'll come no more, and others have his fate.
 „*Fletcher the Muses darling, and choice love*
 „*Of Phoebus, the delight of every Grove;*
 „*Vpon whose head the Laurel grew, whose wit*
 „*Was the Times wonder, and example yet,*
 'Tis within memory, Trees did not throng,
 As once the Story said to *Orpheus* song.
 „*Johnson, t' whose name, wise Art did bow, and Wit*
 „*Is only justified by honouring it:*
 „*To hear whose touch, how would the learned Quire*
 „*With silence stoop³ And when he took his Lyre,*
 „*Apollo dropt his Lute, asham'd to see*
 „*A Rival to the God of Harmome*
 You do forsake him too, we must deplore
 This fate, fot [for] we do know it by our *door*.¹

Acting under such conditions as these can have been little better than no acting at all. The final blow was not long delayed and probably occasioned little surprise when it came. On the 2nd of September the Lords and Commons resolved that,

Whereas the distressed Estate of Ireland, steeped in her own Blood, and the distracted Estate of England, threatned with a Cloud of Blood, by a Civill Warre, call for all possible meanes to appease and avert the Wrath of God appearing in these Judgements; amongst which, Fasting and Prayer having bin often tryed to be very effectuall, have bin lately, and are still ejoynd; and whereas publike Sports doe not well agree with publike Calamities, nor publike Stage-plays with the Seasons of Humiliation, this being an Exercise of sad and pious solemnity, and the other being

¹ 1652 quarto, A₃-A₃^v.

Spectacles of pleasure, too commonly expressing laciuous Mirth and Levitie It is therefore thought fit, and Ordeined by the Lords and Commons in this Parliament Assembled, that while these sad Causes and set times of Humiliation doe continue, publike Stage-Playes shall cease, and bee forborne ¹

This order really put an end to the King's company, though we have some pitiful glimpses of their struggles to continue an organization during the Civil Wars and later.² Upon the suppression of the theatres, as we learn from Bird's Chancery suit, mentioned above,³ the company was dissolved, and Michael Bowyer, Thomas Pollard, and others, during Bird's absence from London, 'seized upon all the said apparel, hangings, books, and other goods . . . and sold and converted the same to their own uses'.⁴ A melancholy end for the trappings of those who had delighted the King and his subjects.

¹ See Appendix, p. 690, for full document. It is not impossible that the plague reports had something to do with the passage of this resolution. The last four reports had given forty-eight, forty-eight, fifty-eight, and sixty deaths (see Appendix, p. 671).

² See Hotson, chapter 1. The most significant later appearances of the King's men are (1) the signatures of ten players to the dedication of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647—John Lowin, Richard Robinson, Eyllaerd Swanston, Hugh Clark, Stephen Hammerton, Joseph Taylor, Robert Benfield, Thomas Pollard, William Allen, Theophilus Bird, (2) the list of signatories to the bond to Thomas Morrison, Bowyer's heir, in January 1647/8—Lowin, Robinson, Benfield, Pollard, Clarke, Hammerton, and Bird, apparently these men expected soon to begin playing again, (3) the players who acted *Rollo, or The Bloody Brother* in the winter of 1648. Lowin, Taylor, Pollard, Burt, and Hart. See 'Players', for the later careers of the King's men.

³ pp 56-7.

⁴ Hotson, p. 32.

LISTS OF THE ACTORS OF THE KING'S COMPANY

In the following tables I have set forth all known lists of the King's men after 1616. The large number of lists (forty-nine) and of actors (seventy-six) has made it expedient to set forth this material on eighteen pages instead of on one large sheet. Each list is broken in two, with the first thirty-eight actors listed on one page and the last thirty-eight on the facing page. The actors are listed as far as possible in chronological order: first those who belonged to the organization in 1616, followed by the others in the approximate order of their first appearance in the company records.

I have indicated the order in which the names occur in the various lists, except in casts where roles are assigned; in such cases I have thought the roles more important than the order.

The lists come from the following sources:

1. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *M.S.C.* 1. 280-2
6. *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Report IV, Part 1, p. 299
7. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679
8. *Greg, Dram. Doc.*, p. 273.
9. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Report IV, Part 1, p. 299
15. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679.
16. *Ibid.*
17. 1623 quarto
18. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*
22. *P.C.C.* 83 Byrd. See below, pp. 649-51.
23. *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies*, 1679
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Herbert*, p. 21.
27. *B.M. Add. MS.* 19256, p. 44. See above, pp. 15-16.
28. *M.S.C.* 11. 325-6.
29. *M.S.C.* 1. 282-3.
30. 1634 quarto.
31. 1629 quarto.
32. 1629 quarto.

33. *M.S.C* ii 350.
34. 1630 quarto.
35. 1629 quarto
36. *Comedies and Tragedies*, 1647
37. Pafford edition for the Malone Society. Pafford and Greg seem to prefer the date 1633 for the production of the play, but this is too late. They did not know that Sharpe, who is cast for the romantic lead, was buried 25 January 1631/2. The play dates after 1629, for Honyman, who had female leads in two plays of that year, has a minor adult role here. The casting of the play is most like that of *The Swisser*, dated 1631. It seems to me that the play should be dated as early as possible, for Fewtricks, whose small size is pointedly referred to four times, was played by Alexander Golfe, who was nineteen in 1633. The most likely date seems to me to be 1630.
38. B.M. Add. MS. 36759, ed. Feuillerat.
39. B.M. Egerton MS. 2828, ed. Sisson for the Malone Society. See pp. xxxi-xxxii.
40. 1652 folio.
41. *Herbert*, pp. 20-1
42. *M.S.C.* ii. 362-73. The sharers are designated by S, the petitioners by P.
43. *M.S.C.* ii. 378-9. See above, pp. 49-51.
44. *M.S.C.* ii. 380. See above, p. 49, n. 2.
45. *M.S.C.* ii. 397
46. *Historia Histrionica*. See Appendix, pp. 691-6
47. *Comedies and Tragedies*, 1647.
48. Hotson, pp. 31-4, and above, pp. 56-7
49. *Historia Histrionica*. See Appendix, p. 695.

<i>Actors</i>	1 <i>Mad Lozer 1616</i>	2 <i>Queen of Corinth 1616-17</i>	3 <i>Knight of Malta 1616-18</i>	4 <i>Loyal Subject 16 Nov 1618</i>	5 <i>Patent of 27 Mar 1619</i>	6 <i>Livery List 19 May 1619</i>
John Heminges	1	1
Rich Burbage . .	1	1	1	1	2	..
Henry Condell . .	4	2	5	2	3	2
John Lowin . .	5	6	7	3	4	3
Nich Tooley . .	.	7	.	7	5	6
John Underwood	3	3	6	6	5
Nathan Field . .	3	5	2	5	7	4
Robt Benfield . .	2	.	6	..	8	8
Robt Gough	9	7
Wm Eccleston . .	6	..	.	8	10	9
Rich Robinson	11	11
John Shank	12	10
Rich Sharpe . .	7	.	4	4	.	.
Tho. Pollard . .	.	4
Tho Holcomb . .	.	8	8
Joseph Taylor	12
George Birche
John Rice
R. T
G. Lowen
Michael
John Thompson
James Horne
Wm Rowley
Edw Knight
William Patrick
William Chambers
Ambrose Byland
Henry Wilson
Jeffrey Collins
William Sanders
Nich Underhill
Henry Clay
George Vernon
Robert Pallant
Thomas Tuckfield
Geo Rickner
Robert Clarke

<i>Actors</i>	1 <i>Mad Lover 1616</i>	2 <i>Queen of Corinth 1616-17</i>	3 <i>Knight of Malta 1616-18</i>	4 <i>Loyal Subject 16 Nov 1618</i>	5 <i>Patent of 27 Mar 1619</i>	6 <i>Livery List 19 May 1619</i>
John Rhodes	
William Mago	
Anthony Knight
Edward Ashborne
William Carver
Alexander Bullard	
William Tawyer
William Gascoigne
Eyllaerd Swanston
Curtis Greville
Anthony Smith	
John Honyman
William Trigg	
Alexander Gough	
William Penn
Richard Baxter
Thomas Hobbes
Richard Perkins
Edward Horton	
Nicholas Burt
Francis Balls
Rowland Dowle
Hubert
Stephen Hammerton
William Hart
Richard Hawley
Henry Pettingham
Richard Bowers
John Bacon
Edward Collins
John Allington
William Styles
Michael Bowyer
William Robbins
William Allen
Hugh Clark
Theophilus Bird
Clun

<i>Actors</i>	7 <i>Humorous Lieut 1619?</i>	8 <i>Barnavelt August, 1619</i>	9 <i>Custom of the Country c. 1619- 20</i>	10 <i>Laws of Candy 1619?</i>	11 <i>False One c 1620</i>	12 <i>Island Prin- cess 1619- 21</i>
Heminges
Burbage
Condell .	1
Lowin .	2	.	2	5	1	1
Tooley	3	3	6	..
Underwood .	7	..	4	6	2	2
Field
Benfield .	4	..	5	.	3	6
R. Gough .	..	Attendant
Eccleston .	6	.	6	2	..	3
R. Robinson .	..	{ Capt, Amba- sador
Shank
Sharpe .	3	..	7	4	4	4
Pollard .	8	{ Holderus, Servant	.	8	.	8
Holcomb .	..	Provost's wife	8
Taylor .	5	..	1	1	5	5
Birche .	.	Servant ?	.	7	8	7
Rice .	..	{ Captain, Servant	..	.	7	.
R T. .	..	{ Mess, off, servt
G. Lowen .	.	Barnavelt's dau
Michael .	..	{ Captain, soldier, huntsman
Thompson
Horne
W. Rowley
E. Knight
Patrick
Chambers
Byland
Wilson
Collins
Sanders
Underhill .	..	Barnavelt's wife ?
Clay
Vernon

<i>Actors</i>	7 <i>Humorous Leut 1619?</i>	8 <i>Barnavelt August, 1619</i>	9 <i>Custom of the Country c 1619- 20</i>	10 <i>Laws of Candy 1619?</i>	11 <i>False One c 1620</i>	12 <i>Island Prin- cess 1619- 21</i>
R Pallant
Tuckfield
R Clarke
Rickner
Rhodes
Mago
A. Knight
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston
Greville
Anth Smith
J Honyman
Trigg
A Gough
Penn
R Baxter
Hobbes
Perkins
Horton
Burt
Balls
Dowles
Hubert
S Hammerton
Hart
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

<i>Actors</i>	13 <i>Women Pleased 1619-21</i>	14 <i>Luery Last 7 Apr 1621</i>	15 <i>Little F. Lawyer 1619-22</i>	16 <i>Pilgrim 1621</i>	17 <i>Duchess of Malfi. 1619-23</i>
Heminges	..	1
Burbage
Condell	..	2
Lowin	5	3	2	5	Bosola
Tooley	7	6	5	2	Forobosco & madman
Underwood	2	5	3	6	Delio & madman
Field
Benfield	3	8	4	3	Antonio
R. Gough	..	7
Eccleston	6	9	6	.	..
R. Robinson	..	11	..	.	Cardinal
Shank	..	10		.	..
Sharpe	4	..	7	..	Duchess
Pollard		Silvio
Holcomb	8	..	8
Taylor	1	12	1	1	Ferdinand
Birche	7	..
Rice	.	4	Pescara
R. T.
G. Lowen
Michael
Thompson	4	Cardinal's mistress
Horne	8	.
W. Rowley
E. Knight
Patrick
Chambers
Byland
Wilson
Collins
Sanders
Underhill
Clay
Vernon
R. Pallant	{ Doctor, Cariola, court officers ^a
Tuckfield
R. Clarke
Rickner

^a This is certainly a mistake in the quarto's assignment of these roles. See Pallant under 'Players'.

	13	14	15	16	17
<i>Actors</i>	<i>Women Pleased 1619-21</i>	<i>Livery List 7 Apr 1621</i>	<i>Little F. Lawyer 1619-22</i>	<i>Pilgrim 1621</i>	<i>Duchess of Malfi 1619-23</i>
Rhodes
Mago
A Knight
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston
Greville
Anth. Smith
J Honyman
Trigg
A Gough
Penn
R Baxter
Hobbes
Perkins
Horton
Burt
Balls
Dowle
Hubert
S Hammerton
Hart
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E. Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H. Clark
Bird
Clun

<i>Actors</i>	18 <i>Double Marriage c 1621</i>	19 <i>Sea Voyage 22 June 1622</i>	20 <i>Spanish Curate 24 Oct 1622</i>	21 <i>The Prophet- ess 14 May 1622</i>	22 <i>Will of Tooley 3 June 1623</i>	23 <i>Maid in the Mill 29 Aug 1623</i>
Heminges
Burbage
Condell	x	.
Lowin . . .	5	4	2	1	.	2
Tooley . . .	7	3	3	6		.
Underwood . . .	3	5	.	..	x	3
Field
Benfield . . .	2	..	6	2		6
R Gough
Eccleston	2	4		x	..
R. Robinson . . .	6	x	..
Shank	3	.	.
Sharpe . . .	8	4	..	.
Pollard	5	7
Holcomb	8	..	.
Taylor . . .	1	1	1	5	x	1
Birche . . .	4	7
Rice
R T
G Lowen
Michael
Thompson	5
Horne
W. Rowley	4
E Knight
Patrick
Chambers
Byland	
H. Wilson
J. Collins
Sanders
Underhill
Clay
Vernon
R. Pallant
Tuckfield
R Clarke
Rickner

<i>Actors</i>	18 <i>Double Marriage c 1621</i>	19 <i>Sea Voyage 22 June 1622</i>	20 <i>Spanish Curate 24 Oct 1622</i>	21 <i>The Pro- phetess 14 May 1622</i>	22 <i>Will of Tooley 3 June 1623</i>	23 <i>Maid in the Mill 29 Aug 1623</i>
Rhodes	
Mago
A Knight
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston
Greville
Anth Smith
J Honyman
Trigg		
A Gough
Penn		
R Baxter
Hobbes
Perkins
Horton
Burt
Balls
Dowle
Hubert
S Hammerton
Hart
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

	24 <i>Lover's Progress 6 Dec 1623</i>	25 <i>Wife for a Month 27 May 1624</i>	26 <i>Spanish Vice Sub- mission 20 Dec 1624</i>	27 <i>Hired Men Pro- tected 27 Dec 1624</i>	28 <i>Funeral Livery >5 May 1625</i>	29 <i>Patent 24 June 1625</i>
<i>Actors</i>						
Heminges	I	I
Burbage
Condell	2	2
Lowin . . .	5	.	7	.	15	3
Tooley	3
Underwood . .	6	5
Field
Benfield . . .	2	4	5	..	11	6
R Gough
Eccleston
R Robinson	2	2	..	6	5
Shank	8	..	8	7
Sharpe . . .	7	..	11	.	5	12
Pollard . . .	3	..	4	.	14	13
Holcomb
Taylor . . .	I	I	I	..	10	4
Birche . . .	4	6	6	..	4	11
Rice	9	..	12	9
R T.
G. Lowen
Michael
Thompson . . .	8
Horne	13	..
W Rowley	10	8
E. Knight	I
Patrick	2
Chambers	3	.	..
Byland	4
H. Wilson	5
J Collins	6
Sanders	7
Underhill	8
Clay	9
Vernon	10	7	..
R. Pallant	11
Tuckfield	12
R. Clarke	13
Rickner	[deleted]

<i>Actors</i>	24 <i>Lover's Progress 6 Dec 1623</i>	25 <i>Wife for a Month 27 May 1624</i>	26 <i>Spanish Vice Sub mission 20 Dec 1624</i>	27 <i>Hired Men Pro tected 27 Dec 1624</i>	28 <i>Funeral Livery > 5 May 1625</i>	29 <i>Patent 24 June 1625</i>
Rhodes		14	.	.
Mago	15	..	.
A Knight	16
Ashborne	17	.	..
Carver	18
Bullard	19	.	..
Tawyer	20	..	.
Gascoigne	21	.	.
Swanston	3	.	9	10
Greville
Anth Smith
J Honyman
Trigg
A Gough		
Penn
R Baxter.	
Hobbes	
Perkins	3	..
Horton	
Burt	
Balls
Dowle
Hubert
S. Hammerton
Hart
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

	30	31	32	33	34
<i>Actors</i>	<i>Two Noble Kinsmen c 1625-6</i>	<i>Roman Actor licensed 11 Oct 1626</i>	<i>Lovers' Melan- choly licensed 24 Nov 1628</i>	<i>Livery List 6 May 1629</i>	<i>Picture licensed 8 June 1629</i>
Heminges	1	..
Burbage
Condell
Lowin .	.	Caesar	1	2	Eubulus
Tooley
Underwood
Field
Benfield .	..	Rusticus	3	6	Ladislaus
R. Gough
Eccleston
R. Robinson .	..	Æsopus	..	4	..
Shank	4	5	Hilario
Sharpe .	..	Parthenius	7	7	Ferdinand
Pollard .	..	{Ælus, Lamia, Stephanos}	8	9	Ubaldo
Holcomb
Taylor .	..	Paris	2	3	Mathias
Birche
Rice
R. T.
G Lowen
Michael
Thompson .	..	Domitia	13	..	Honoria
Horne .	..	A Lictor	15	14	..
W. Rowley
E. Knight
Patrick .	..	{Palphurius Sura}
Chambers
Byland
H. Wilson
J. Collins
Sanders
Underhill
Clay
Vernon .	..	A Lictor	11	13	..
R Pallant
Tuckfield .	Attendant
R. Clarke
Rickner

<i>Actors</i>	30 <i>Two Noble Kinsmen c 1625-6</i>	31 <i>Roman Actor licensed 11 Oct. 1626</i>	32 <i>Lovers' Melan- choly licensed 24 Nov 1628</i>	33 <i>Lwery List 6 May 1629</i>	34 <i>Picture licensed 8 June 1629</i>
Rhodes
Mago
A Knight
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston .	.	Aretinus	5	8	Ricardo
Greville .	{ Messenger and Attendant }	Latinus	10	..	.
Anth. Smith .	.	Philargus	6	10	.
J Honyman .	..	Domitilla	14	..	Sophia
Trigg .	.	Julia	16	..	Corsica
A Gough .	..	Caenis	17	..	Acanthe
Penn .	.	.	9	12	Baptista
R Baxter	12	..	.
Hobbes	11	.
Perkins
Horton
Burt
Balls
Dowle
Hubert
S Hammerton
Hart
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E. Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

<i>Actors</i>	35 <i>Deserving Favourite published 1629</i>	36 <i>Mad Lover revival c 1630</i>	37 <i>Soddered Citizen c 1630</i>	38 <i>Swisser 1631</i>	39 <i>Believe as You Last licensed 7 May 1631</i>
Heminges
Burbage
Condell
Lowin .	Jacomo	..	Undermyne	Andruchio	{ Titus Flaminius
Tooley
Underwood
Field
Benfield .	King	..	Makewell	Antharis	Marcellus
R. Gough
Eccleston
R. Robinson.	{ Count Orsino, Hermite	Lentulus
Shank	Hodge
Sharpe .	Lysander	..	Sir Witt- worth ^b	{ King of the Lom- bards	.
Pollard	Brainsicke	Timentes	Berecanthus
Holcomb
Taylor .	Duke	Arnoldus	Antiochus
Birche
Rice
R. T.
G. Lowen
Michael
Thompson .	Cleonarda	.	Miniona	Panopia	..
Horne
W. Rowley
E. Knight
Patrick	{ First Demetrius & Captain
Chambers
Byland
H. Wilson	Lute Player
J. Collins
Sanders
Underhill	Shackle	..	(?) Two partsc
Clay
Vernon
R. Pallant
Tuckfield
R. Clarke
Rickner

^b Sharpe also gave the prologue and epilogue of this play.^c Attendant and Carthaginian Officer.

<i>Actors</i>	³⁵ <i>Deserving Favourite published 1629</i>	³⁶ <i>Mad Lover revival c. 1630</i>	³⁷ <i>Soddered Citizen c 1630</i>	³⁸ <i>Swissler 1631</i>	³⁹ <i>Believe as You List licensed 7 May 1631</i>
Rhodes .	.	.			
Mago .	.	.			{ Officer and attendant
A Knight		.			
Ashborne
Carver .	..				
Bullard	..	.			
Tawyer
Gascoigne		Opens door
Swanston .	{ Count Utrante	..	.	Alcidonus	Chrysalus
Greville	.		Mountayne	Iseas	3rd Mer- chant
Anth Smith	Gerard	.	Clutch	Asprandus	
J Honyman.	Clarinda	.	Sly		1st Merchant
Trigg .		.	Modestina	Selma	.
A Gough .		.	Fewtricks	Eurinia	.
Penn	Clephus	{ 2nd Mer- chant and Jailor
R Baxter .		Servant ^d			Three parts ^d
Hobbes			.		2nd Calistus
Perkins	
Horton .	Mariana	Boy		.	..
Burt	(?) Two parts ^e
Balls	Two parts ^f
Dowle	Four parts ^g
Hubert	Opens door
S Hammerton
Hart	
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E. Collins
Allington
Styles
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

d First Calistus, Titus, and Attendant. e Attendant and Carthaginian
Officer f Second Demetrius and Attendant g Third Demetrius,
Carthaginian Officer, Attendant, and Jailor's assistant

<i>Actors</i>	⁴⁰ <i>Wild Goose Chase Revival 1632</i>	⁴¹ <i>Tamer Tamed Trouble October 1633</i>	⁴² <i>Sharer Papers 1635</i>	⁴³ <i>Pass 17 May 1636</i>	⁴⁴ <i>Tickets of Privilege 12 Jan. 1636/7</i>
Heminges
Burbage
Condell
Lowin	Belleur	x	S	..	
Tooley
Underwood
Field
Benfield	De Gard	x	P
R. Gough
Eccleston
R. Robinson	La Castre
Shank	Petella	.	S		.
Sharpe
Pollard	Pinac	..	P
Holcomb
Taylor	Mirabell	x	S	.	
Birche	
Rice
R. T
G. Lowen
Michael
Thompson
Horne	
W. Rowley
E. Knight	?
Patrick	4	4
Chambers
Byland
H. Wilson
J. Collins
Sanders
Underhill
Clay
Vernon
R. Pallant
Tuckfield
R. Clarke
Rickner

<i>Actors</i>	⁴⁰ <i>Wild Goose Chase Renewal 1632</i>	⁴¹ <i>Tamer Tamed Trouble October 1633</i>	⁴² <i>Sharer Papers 1635</i>	⁴³ <i>Pass 17 May 1636</i>	⁴⁴ <i>Tickets of Privilege 12 Jan 1636/7</i>
Rhodes
Mago
A Knight	?
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston	Lugier	x	P
Greville
Anth Smith
J Honyman	{ Young Factor
Trigg	Rosalura	3	..
A Gough	Lillia-B.	6	..
Penn	Nantolet	..	.	1	..
R. Baxter	5	1
Hobbes	2	..
Perkins
Horton
Burt
Balls
Dowle	7
Hubert
S Hammerton	Oriana
Hart	7	3
Hawley	8	2
Pettingham	5
Bowers	6
Bacon	8
E. Collins	9
Allington	10
Styles	11
Bowyer
Robbins
Allen
H Clark
Bird
Clun

<i>Actors</i>	45 <i>Made Grooms 22 Jan 1640/1</i>	46 <i>Parts Assigned Hist Hist 1642</i>	47 <i>Deasca- tion B & F Folio 1647</i>	48 <i>New Bond to Morrison 28 Jan 1647/8</i>	49 <i>Rollo or The Bloody Brother 1648</i>
Heminges
Burbage	
Condell	
Lowin	{ Falstaff, Morose, Vol- pone, Mammon, Melantius	x	x	Aubrey
Tooley
Underwood
Field
Benfield	x	x	..
R Gough
Eccleston
R Robinson	Comic parts	x	x	..
Shank	{ Comic parts; Sir Roger in <i>The Scorn- ful Lady</i>
Sharpe
Pollard	Comic parts	x	x	Cook
Holcomb
Taylor	{ Iago, Truewit, Ham- let, and Face	x	..	Rollo
Birche
Rice
R. T
G Lowen
Michael
Thompson
Horne
W Rowley
E Knight
Patrick
Chambers
Byland
H Wilson
J Collins
Sanders
Underhill
Clay
Vernon
R Pallant
Tuckfield
R. Clarke
Rickner

<i>Actors</i>	45 <i>Made Grooms 22 Jan 1640/1</i>	46 <i>Parts Assigned Hist Hist 1642</i>	47 <i>Dedica- tion B & F Folio 1647</i>	48 <i>New Bond to Morrison 28 Jan 1647/8</i>	49 <i>Rollo or The Bloody Brother 1648</i>
Rhodes
Mago
A Knight
Ashborne
Carver
Bullard
Tawyer
Gascoigne
Swanston .	..	Othello	x	.	..
Greville
Anth Smith
J Honyman
Trigg
A. Gough .	..	Women's parts
Penn
R Baxter
Hobbes	
Perkins
Horton		
Burt . .	.	Women's parts		..	Latorch
Balls
Dowle
Hubert
S. Hammerton .	6	{ Amintor, beautiful women, young lovers	x	x	..
Hart	{ Duchess in <i>The Car-</i> <i>dinal</i> , women's parts	.	..	Otto
Hawley
Pettingham
Bowers
Bacon
E. Collins
Allington
Styles	
Bowyer . .	1
Robbins . .	2
Allen . .	3	..	x
H. Clark . .	4	..	x	x	..
Bird . .	5	.	x	x	..
Clun . .	.	Women's parts

LIVERY ALLOWANCES FOR THE KING'S MEN

It is obvious that livery allowances were issued biennially to the King's company about Easter. Most of the Caroline allowances mention the customary period or date or both. The warrant for 1629, after listing the names of the players, continues:

to each of them the seuerall Allowances of foure yardes of Bastard Skarlet for a Cloake & a q^{ter} of a yard of Crimson Veluet for the Cape, it beeing the vsuall Allowance graunted vnto them by his Ma^{tye} euery second yeare and due at Easter last past.¹

Miss Boswell has pointed out that previous to 1627 the allowance had been three yards for a cloak, but that in 1627 and thereafter it was four yards.² This knowledge of the

Livery Allowances for the King's Men

<i>Date</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Payable to</i>	<i>Source</i>
1619, May 19	12	John Heminges	<i>Hist MSS Com.</i> , Report IV, Part I, p 299.
1621, Apr 7	12	John Heminges	<i>Ibid</i>
1623	12 ^a		<i>M.S.C.</i> ii 327-8
1623-4	1	..	<i>Ibid.</i>
1625	13 ^b		<i>Ibid.</i>
1625, > May 5 ^c	15	..	<i>Ibid</i> , pp 325-6
1627	14 ^d	..	<i>Ibid</i> , pp 327-8
1629, May 6	14	..	<i>Ibid</i> , p 350.
1631, Apr 27	14	Joseph Taylor	<i>Ibid</i> , p 355.
1633, Apr. 15	14	John Lowin	<i>Ibid</i> , p 360
1635, Apr 3	14	John Lowin	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 376.
1637, Apr 22	16	Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston	<i>Ibid</i> , p. 383
1638/9, Mar 14	16	Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 389.
1640/1, Mar. 20	18	Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston.	<i>Ibid</i> , pp 397-8

¹ *M S C* ii. 350.

² *Ibid.*, p 327

^a The number of players granted livery can be deduced from the fact that the Particular Warrants to the Great Wardrobe show that 36 yards of bastard scarlet were issued for players, and we know that they received 3 yards per man at this time. An extra grant was made to Richard Perkins in 1623 or 1624 (see next item). The names of the other players are not given.

^b The number is deduced from the yards of material issued by the Great Wardrobe. No names are given.

^c This livery allowance was not the regular one for 1625, but a special issue, presumably black, for the funeral of King James.

^d The number is deduced from the yards of material issued by the Great Wardrobe. No names are given.

amount of material allowed to each player enables us to tell how many players were granted livery in 1623 and 1627. Though the warrants for those years are not extant, the records of the Great Wardrobe are, and we can find the number of players by dividing the total number of yards by the quota for each player.

PROVINCIAL NOTICES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
1616-17	Oxford ^a	Boas, p 30
1617-18	Ipswich	<i>M.S.C.</i> , ii 283
1617-18	Winchester	Murray, i 184
1618	Stratford-on-Avon	Barnard, <i>New Links</i> , p. 5
4 June 1618	Marlborough	Murray, i 184
3 Nov. 1618	Reading	<i>Hist. MSS. Com</i> , Report XI, Part VII, p. 210.
14 Nov. 1618	Marlborough	Murray, i 184
1619	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i>
10 Jan 1619/20	Coventry	<i>Ibid.</i>
1620-20 Feb 1620/1	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i>
April, 1621	Nottingham	Murray, ii 376
1621-2	Oxford	Boas, p 31
c Apr. 1622	Dover	Murray, i 184
8 June 1622	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i> , ii 314.
26 Aug 1622	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 315.
1622-3 (probably autumn 1622)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Ser. X, xii (1909), 42
24 Apr 1623	Canterbury	Murray, ii 232
22 Sept 1623	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 315
1623-4 (probably spring 1624)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Ser. X, xii (1909), 42.
1624 (twice)	Worcester	Murray, ii 409
1624.	Craven District	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 255
Spring 1625	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Ser X, xii (1909), 42.
16 Nov. 1626	Coventry	Murray, ii. 250.
1627	Leicester	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 317
9 Jan. 1627/8	Coventry	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 251
1 Sept. 1628	Coventry	<i>Ibid.</i>
1628-9	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Ser X, xii (1909), 42.
9 Mar. 1629/30	Canterbury	Murray, ii. 232.
1629-30 (probably spring 1630)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Ser X, xii (1909), 42.
Spring 1630	Saffron Walden	<i>Ibid.</i>
Apr.-June 1630	Bristol	Murray, ii 219
1631	Worcester	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 410
May 1631	Doncaster	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 257.
20 Aug. 1631	Doncaster	<i>Ibid.</i>
June-Sept. 1631	Bristol	<i>Ibid.</i> ii 219
1632	Worcester	<i>Ibid.</i> , i. 184
8 April-8 May 1633	Dover	<i>Ibid.</i> , ii. 267.
March 1633/4	Doncaster	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 257.
27 March 1634	Southampton	<i>Ibid.</i> i 184.
1634-5	Southampton	<i>Ibid.</i> ii. 399.

^a This item and all others except the eight from Murray, i. 184, escaped Professor Murray's notice when he compiled the list of provincial visits of the King's men at the end of his chapter on that company. Many of them probably refer to the provincial rather than the London company. Unless, however, there is something in the record which definitely suggests the provincial organization, all records of provincial visits by a company called King's players are listed here.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
1634	Dunwich	<i>Hist MSS Com</i> ^b
13 Apr 1635	Coventry	Murray, II 252
Aug. 1636	Coventry	Ibid I 184
1636	Windsor	Ibid. II 407
>20 Nov. 1636	Coventry	Ibid , p 252
>20 Nov 1638	Coventry	Ibid , p 253
26 June 1641	Doncaster	Ibid , p 257

^b In the accounts of Dunwich in Suffolk (*Hist MSS Com.*, Records of the Dissolved Corporation of Dunwich, p 97) appears, 'To the King's players, v s.'

THE KING'S MEN'S PLAYS AT COURT

Production date	Plays given	Paid	Amt.	Source
1 Nov 1615 to 1 Apr. 1616	14	29 Apr 1616 ^a	£140	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
1 Nov. 1616 to 2 Feb 1616/17	13	11 Mar 1616/17	130	Ibid
5 Jan 1616/17 1617-1617/18	15	<i>Diary of Lady Anne Clifford</i> , p 47
6 Apr. 1618	<i>The Mad Lover</i>	24 Feb. 1617/18	150	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
7 Apr. 1618	<i>Twelfth Night</i>	20 Apr 1618	20	Cunningham, <i>Revels</i> , p xlv, and Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
3 May 1618	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	15 May 1618	10	Ibid
1 Nov 1618 to 1618/19	<i>Merry Devil of Edmonton</i>	19 Apr 1619	73 6 8	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
20 May 1619	<i>Penciles</i>	..	.	<i>C S P, Dom</i> , 1619-23, p 47, No. 46
> Jan 1619/20 ^b	2	<i>N & Q</i> , 4 Mar 1871, p 183
1619 to 1619/20	10	23 Mar 1619/20	100	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
1619-20 ^c
30 Apr 1620	1	20 May 1620	10	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256
1620-1620/1	9	17 Mar 1620/1	90	Ibid
5 Nov. 1621	<i>The Woman's Plot</i>
26 Nov. 1621	<i>The Woman Is Too Hard</i> for Him
26 Dec. 1621	<i>The Island Princess</i>	27 Mar 1622	60	Murray, ii 193, Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p 256.
1 Jan 1621/2	<i>The Pilgrim</i>
24 Jan 1621/2	<i>The Wild Goose Chase</i>
5 Mar 1621/2	<i>The Coxcomb</i>
26 Dec 1622	<i>The Spanish Curate</i>
27 Dec. 1622	<i>The Beggars' Bush</i>
29 Dec. 1622	<i>The Pilgrim</i>
1 Jan. 1622/3	<i>The Alchemist</i>	14 Mar. 1622/3	90 ^d	<i>Herbert</i> , pp 49-50, Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p. 256
2 Feb 1622/3	<i>Twelfth Night</i>
> 14 Mar. 1622/3	4

29 Sept 1623	<i>The Maid in the Mill</i>			
1 Nov 1623	<i>The Maid in the Mill</i>			
26 Dec. 1623	<i>The Maid in the Mill</i>			
28 Dec. 1623	<i>The Buck Is a Thief</i>			
1 Jan. 1623/4	<i>The Wandering Lovers</i>			
6 Jan. 1623/4	<i>More Dissemblers besides Women</i>			
18 Jan. 1623/4	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>			
>17 Feb 1623/4	<i>Rule a Wife and Have a Wife</i> ³	17 Feb 1623/4	£100 ^e	Herbert, pp 50-1, Stopes, Burbage, p 257.
2 Nov 1624	<i>Rule a Wife and Have a Wife</i>			
26 Dec. 1624	<i>The Fox</i>			
27 Dec. 1624	<i>I, Sir John Falstaff</i>			
1 Jan. 1624/5		22 Mar. 1624/5	50 ^f	Herbert, p 52, Stopes, Burbage, p 257
>22 Mar. 1624/5				

^a Hemmings received all payments up to and including that of 30 May 1626

^b This information is derived from the bill of Thomas Cooke for two trips from Whitehall to London to command Ben Jonson and the King's players to attend the Prince at court. It may well be that the performances which they presumably gave were included in the payment for ten court performances, 23 March 1619/20

^c Though we have no assurance that they were presented at court, the plays of the lists which Mr. Frank Marcham found among the waste papers of the Revels Office deserve consideration here (See Marcham, *Revels, passim*, and E. K. Chambers, *R E S* 1 479-84). Sir Edmund Chambers has made the plausible suggestion that these plays were being considered for presentation at court, evidently about 1619 or 1620. There are twenty-nine plays in all. A few of them appear for the first time in this list, others have been known before, but only by title, most of them are fairly well-known plays. The following plays of the lists are known to have been the property of the King's company

'Maioir of Qunborough or Hengist'

'K. of Kent'

'The Maides Tragedy'

'The Tragedy of Ham.'

'The History of Phil . . . or Love lies

a bleed . . .'

'The Captaine'

'The Winters Tale'

'The 2. Noble Kinesmen'

'The Fox' (Deleted)

'the Bridegr . . . (presumably to be

identified with *The Bridegroom and*

the Madman of the 1641 King's list)

'the scilient Woeman'

'D'Ambos'

'ght of Malta'

'[Seco]nd part of Falstaff [not p]laid

'yes 7 yeres' (the emendations are

suggested by Sir Edmund Chambers)

^d Hemmings was paid for nine plays at court on this date, probably the five named were included

^e Hemmings was paid for ten plays at court on this date, probably the seven named were included

^f Hemmings was paid for five plays, which probably included the four named

THE KING'S MEN'S PLAYS AT COURT—Continued

Production date	Plays given	Paid	Am't	Source
12 Jan. 1624/5 1625-6	I 10 ^h	20 Feb. 1624/5 ^g 30 May 1626 ^g	£10 100	Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , p. 257. Ibid.
29 Sept 1627- 31 Jan 1627/8	10	10 Apr. 1628 ^h	100	M.S.C. II 346, Stopes, <i>Burbage</i> , pp. 257 and 258.
15 Apr 1628 Christmas 1628-	<i>The Dumb Bawd of Venice</i>	9 May 1628 ^h	10	M.S.C. II. 347 ^k
2 Feb 1628/9	16 <i>The Lovesick Maid</i>	27 Feb. 1628/9 ^l	160	Ibid., p. 349.
6 Apr. 1629	12 <i>The Inconstant Lady</i>	6 May 1629 ^l	10	Ibid., p. 349.
Xmas 1629/30	'Alfonso' <i>Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	3 Apr. 1630 ^l	120	Ibid., p. 352
30 Sept. 1630	[<i>The Custom of the Country</i> <i>'An Induction for the House,</i> <i>And The Madde Loner'</i> <i>Rollo</i> <i>The Fox</i> <i>Beauty in a Trance</i> <i>The Beggars' Bush</i> <i>The Maid's Tragedy</i> <i>Philaster</i> <i>The Duchess of Malfi</i> <i>The Scornful Lady</i> <i>The Chances</i> <i>Oldcastle</i> <i>The Fatal Dowry</i> <i>A King and No King</i> <i>The Merry Devil of Ed-</i> <i>monton</i> <i>Every Man in His Humor</i> <i>Rollo</i>]			
17 Oct. 1630				
24 Oct. 1630				
5 Nov. 1630				
7 Nov. 1630				
19 Nov. 1630				
28 Nov 1630				
30 Nov. 1630				
9 Dec. 1630				
14 Dec. 1630				
26 Dec. 1630				
27 Dec. 1630				
30 Dec. 1630				
6 Jan. 1630/1				
3 Feb. 1630/1				
10 Feb 1630/1				
15 Feb 1630/1		17 Mar. 1630/1 ¹	260 ^l	Folger MS ; M S C. II 354-5
17 Feb. 1630/1				
21 Feb. 1630/1				

Xmas 1631/2	11 ^m	22 Feb. 1631/2 ⁿ	120	M S C ii 358
3 May 1632-	23 and one rehearsal	16 Mar 1632/3 ⁿ	270	Ibid. p 360.
16 Nov 1632/3	<i>Richard III</i>			
26 Nov. 1633	<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>			
28 Nov. 1633	<i>The Tamer Tamed</i>			
10 Dec. 1633	<i>The Loyal Subject</i>			
1 Jan 1633/4	<i>Cymbeline</i>			
6 Jan. 1633/4	<i>The Faithful Shepherdess</i>	27 Apr. 1634	220P	Herbert, pp 53-5, M S C ii 373.
12 Jan. 1633/4	<i>The Guardian</i>			
16 Jan 1633/4	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>			
28 Jan. 1633/4	<i>The Wits</i>			
7 Apr. 1634	<i>Bussy d'Ambois</i>			
8 Apr. 1634	<i>The Pastoral</i>			
27 Apr 1633-				
13 May 1634	<i>Cleander</i>	..	.	Herbert, p 65 and n 2.

^g Hemmings was payee

^h Jonson's *Staple of News* was acted in 1625, according to the first edition. There is a court prologue On internal evidence, Fleay (B.C.E.D. 1. 384) dates the court performance at Shrovetide 1625/6. If he is right, *The Staple of News* was one of these plays

ⁱ Hemmings, Lowin, and Taylor were paid

^j Hemmings was payee.

^k This is evidently the same warrant which Mrs. Stopes found (Stopes, *Burbage*, p 257). ^l Lowin was payee According to the Lord Chamberlain's warrant, the players were paid £260 for twenty-one plays, four of which (the first four in the list) were acted at Hampton Court and another (the last in the list) acted in the afternoon, causing them to lose their day at Blackfriars. Both the number of plays mentioned and the sum paid indicate that 'An Induction for the Howse' was considered a separate play.

^m One of these plays was probably Massinger's *Emperor of the East*, for the 1632 quarto of the play, which was not licensed until 11 March 1630/1, contains a court prologue

ⁿ Lowin, Taylor, and Swanson were payees.

^o Herbert's item says 17 November, but, as Fleay points out, 16 November is correct.

^p I am assuming that the eleven plays named in Herbert's office-book were included in the twenty-two paid for on this date. Lowin, Taylor, and Swanson were payees

THE KING'S MEN'S PLAYS AT COURT—Continued

Production date	Plays given	Paid	Amt	Source
9 Nov 1634	<i>Cathline</i>	..		Mildmay's Diary, Appendix, p 676.
13 May 1634– 30 Mar. 1635 ^a	20	24 May 1635	£250	M S C ii. 376
Nov. 1635–				<i>Plays and Masques</i> , p. 254.
12 May 1636 ^r	II, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
16 Feb. 1635/6	II, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
18 Feb. 1635/6	<i>The Silent Woman</i>			
1635	16?	10 May 1636 ^s	180	<i>Herbert</i> , p. 55, M S C ii 378.
18 Apr 1636	I, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
19 Apr. 1636	II, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
21 April 1636	<i>The Silent Woman</i>			
5 May 1636	<i>Alphonso</i>			
17 Nov 1636	<i>The Coxcomb</i>			
19 Nov. 1636	<i>The Beggars' Bush</i>			
29 Nov. 1636	<i>The Maid's Tragedy</i>			
6 Dec. 1636	<i>The Loyal Subject</i>			
8 Dec 1636	<i>The Moor of Venice</i>			
16 Dec. 1636	<i>Love's Pilgrimage</i>			
26 Dec. 1636	I, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
27 Dec 1636	II, <i>Arrivagus & Felicia</i>			
1 Jan. 1636/7	<i>Love and Honour</i>			
5 Jan. 1636/7	<i>The Elder Brother</i>			
10 Jan 1636/7	<i>A King and No King</i>			
12 Jan. 1636/7	<i>The Royal Slave</i>			
17 Jan. 1636/7 ^v	<i>Rollo</i>			
24 Jan 1636/7	<i>Hamlet</i>			
31 Jan. 1636/7	<i>Julius Caesar</i>			
9 Feb 1636/7	<i>A Wife for a Month</i>			
17 Feb. 1636/7 ^w	<i>The Governor</i>			
21 Feb. 1636/7	<i>Philaster</i>	15 Mar. 1636/7	240 ^u	<i>Law, Forgeries</i> , p. 39; <i>Herbert</i> , pp 57–8; M S C. ii. 382

30 Sept 1637 to				
3 Feb. 1637/8	<i>Aglaure</i> and 13 others <i>The Lost Lady</i> <i>Bussy d'Ambois</i> <i>Aglaure</i> <i>The Unfortunate Lovers</i> <i>Oldcastle</i> <i>The Unfortunate Lovers</i> <i>I. Passionate Lovers</i> <i>The Unfortunate Lovers</i> <i>The Merry Devil of Edmonion</i> <i>The Fox</i> <i>Caesar</i> <i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i> <i>The Fair Favorite</i>	15 Mar. 1637/8 ^x	£150	M S C ii 387.
26 Mar. 1638				
27 Mar. 1638				
3 Apr. 1638				
23 Apr. 1638				
29 May 1638				
31 May 1638				
10 July 1638				
30 Sept. 1638				
6 Nov. 1638				
8 Nov. 1638				
13 Nov. 1638		12 Mar. 1638/9 ^z	300 ^{aa}	Herbert, pp. 76-7, M.S.C. ii 388-9.
15 Nov. 1638				
20 Nov. 1638				

^q The L.C. books give the dates 1624-5, evidently in error for 1634 and 1635 (See M S C ii. 376.) Lowin was payee
^r The letter of the Prince of the Palatinate which records this performance is undated, but the Prince was in England
from November 1635 to June 1637 The theatres were closed from 12 May 1636 until his departure except for one week,
when it is unlikely that the Queen would have risked infection
^s The company was paid 'for Playes acted in Anno 1635', which probably included II, *Arruagus* and *Felicia* and *The
Silent Woman*.

^t At Blackfriars for the Queen.

^u Lowin and Taylor were paid £210 for twenty-one plays and £30 for *The Royal Slave*, but Swanston signed the receipt.
Other charges for this play reached the sum of £154 (See Law, *Forgeries*, App.)

^v Herbert's list omits this date, dates *Rollo* the 24th, and omits *Hamlet* entirely.

^w The players' bill lists this date as the 16th of February.

^x Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston were payees See above, p. 57, for the identification of Suckling's *Aglaure* as one of the
fourteen plays.

^y For the Queen at Blackfriars.

^z Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston were payees.

^{aa} The warrant directs payment of £20 each for six of these plays given at Hampton Court, but as the players' list men-
tions only five at Hampton Court, the sixth must be the one given at Somerset House on 10 July, when they say they
lost their day at their house. Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston were paid

THE KING'S MEN'S PLAYS AT COURT—Continued

Production date	Plays given	Paid	Amt.	Source
22 Nov. 1638	<i>The Chances</i>			
27 Nov. 1638	<i>The Custom of the Country</i>			
29 Nov. 1638	<i>The Northern Lass</i>			
6 Dec. 1638	<i>The Spanish Curate</i>			
11 Dec. 1638	<i>The Fair Favorite</i>			
18 Dec. 1638	I, <i>Passionate Lovers</i>			
20 Dec. 1638	II, <i>Passionate Lovers</i>			
27 Dec. 1638	II, <i>Passionate Lovers</i>			
28 Dec. 1638	<i>The Northern Lass</i>			
1 Jan. 1638/9	<i>The Beggar's Bush</i>			
7 Jan. 1638/9	<i>The Spanish Curate</i>			
6 Aug. 1639 to 11 Feb. 1639/40	21	4 April 1640 ^{bb}	£230	M S.C. ii 392.
10 Nov. 1640 to 22 Feb. 1640/1	[Not more than 16] ^{cc}	20 Mar 1640/1 ^{bb}	160	Ibid., p 397
6 Jan 1641/2	<i>The Scornful Lady</i> ^{dd}		.	Herbert, p 58

^{bb} Lowin, Taylor, and Swanston were payees.

^{cc} The number of plays is not specified in the warrant

^{dd} There were evidently other plays at court before the war for which the company had not yet been paid in 1646, for in that year the players petitioned the Lords for payment of the money due them, and the Lords recommended that their request be granted. See Hotson, p. 20.

SIR HENRY HERBERT'S LICENCES FOR
THE KING'S MEN

In the following list I have collected the records of Sir Henry Herbert's licences of plays for the King's company. When the extant record from the office-book does not name the company, I have set forth the evidence which identifies the play as the property of the King's men.

There are one or two facts of interest which emerge from this list. Malone said: 'It appears from Sir Henry Herbert's Office-book that the king's company between the years 1622 and 1641 produced either at Blackfriars or the Globe at least four new plays every year.' 'It appears from Sir Henry Herbert's Manuscript, that the king's company usually brought out two or three new plays at the Globe every summer.'¹

It may be of some interest to compare these figures with the fragmentary records from Herbert's office-book which have come down to us. Malone evidently found eighty or more new plays (he says 'at least' four a year) licensed for the company or at least mentioned in this period. We know of forty-six from the licences of the office-book as reconstructed by Professor Adams, one more from a manuscript note of Malone's as reported by Mr W. J. Lawrence, another from a manuscript note of Malone's as reported by Mr. R. C. Bald, and a third, *The Spanish Viceroy*, which the company acted without a licence, a total of forty-nine. Evidently there are at least thirty-one licences of new plays for the company in this period of which we know nothing, though several of the plays must be known.

The yearly averages also afford an interesting comparison (see chart on p. 102). We know of only four years in which as many as four new plays were licensed for the King's men: four in 1622, six in 1624, six in 1629, four in 1634. In 1633, 1636, 1639, and 1642 we know of only one new play, and in the plague years of 1625, 1630, and 1637 we know of none.

It is somewhat surprising that the company should have 'brought out two or three new plays at the Globe every summer'. One would have expected most of the new plays to appear first at the Blackfriars, and, furthermore, in the licence dates for new plays which we know, only seventeen of the forty-nine fall in May, June, July, or August, though it is

¹ *Herbert*, pp. 66-7.

A CHRONOLOGICAL CHART OF NEW PLAYS LICENSED BY
SIR HENRY HERBERT FOR THE KING'S MEN^a

	1622	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	Totals
Jan.	I	I	..	I	..	I ^b	I	I	I	7
Feb.	I	I	..	I	2
Mar.	I	2
Apr.	I	3
May	I	..	I	I	I	I	..	I	..	I	I	7
June	I	..	I	I	..	I	7
July	1
Aug.	..	I	I	2
Sep.	I	2
Oct.	I	I	I	..	I	I	I	7
Nov.	I	I	I	I	I	7
Dec.	..	I	I	2
Totals	4	3	6	0	3	2	2	6	0	3	2	I	4	3	I	0	2	I	3	2	I	49

^a Old plays relicensed are not included in these figures. One unlicensed play, *The Spanish Viceroy*, is included, because Herbert indicates that it was a new play acted by the company, though it was acted without Sir Henry's licence. Wilson's *The Corporal* is not included in the figures for the year 1633, for the curious item which Hazlitt copied from the office-book is not a licence as he gives it, though I suspect it should be (see p. 132 below).

It is interesting to note that new plays were generally licensed in the spring and autumn. Twenty-eight of the forty-nine plays were licensed in the four months of May (7), June (7), October (7), and November (7). It was revised and accepted 7 May 1631.

^b The play is *Believe as You List*, which was submitted to Sir Henry and rejected by him 11 January 1630/1.

noticeable that May and June are among the most popular licensing months.

1622, May 14—'A new play called *The Prophetess*, licensed May 14, 1622.' (Herbert, p. 23) Herbert's summer benefit in 1629 'from the kinges company' was raised on this play (*ibid.*, p. 43), and it appears in the King's men's play-list of 7 August 1641. (See above, pp. 65-6)

1622, June 22—'*The Sea Voyage*. This piece was acted at the Globe.' (Herbert, p. 24)

1622, Sept. 6—Written in Malone's copy of *Biographica Dramatica* is, 'Item 6 Sept., 1622, for perusing and allowing of a new play called *Osmond the Great Turk*, which Mr. Hemmingses and Mr. Rice affirmed to me that Lord Chamberlain gave order to allow of it because I refused at first, containing 22 leaves and a page. Acted by the King's players . . . 20s.' (W. J. Lawrence, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923, p. 820)

1622, Oct. 24—'*The Spanish Curate*. Acted at Blackfriars' (Herbert, p. 24.)

1623, Aug. 19—'For the king's players. An olde playe called *Winter's Tale*, formerly allowed of by Sir George Bucke, and likewise by mee on Mr Hemmings his worde that there was nothing profane added or reformed, thogh the allowed booke was missinge, and therefore I returned it without a fee, this 19 of August, 1623.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 25.)

1623, Aug. 29—"For the King's Players; a new Comedy, called, *The Maid of the Mill*, written by Fletcher, and Rowley.'" (*Ibid.*)

1623, Oct. 17—"For the King's Company. An Old Play, called, *More Dissemblers besides Women*: allowed by Sir George Bucke; and being free from alterations was allowed by me, for a new play, called, *The Devil of Dowgate, or Usury put to use*: Written by Fletcher.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 26.)

1623, Dec. 6—"For the King's Company. *The Wandring Lovers*: Written by Mr. Fletcher.'" (Herbert, p. 27) Evidently *The Lover's Progress*.

1623/4, Mar. 16—"For the king's company. *Shankes Ordinary*, written by Shankes himself, this 16 March, 1623,—1l. os. od.'" MS. Herbert.¹ (*Ibid.*)

1624, Apr. 10—"For the king's company. *The Historye of Henry the First*, written by Dampont, this 10 April, 1624,—1l. o. o.'" (*Ibid.*, pp. 27-8.)

1624, May 27—"For the King's Company, A Comedy, called, *A Wife for a Month*: Written by Fletcher.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 28.)

¹ This statement probably represents two entries run together, the old play relicensed and the new play by Fletcher licensed.

² *Shankes Ordinary* was probably a jig (*H.E.D.P.* iii. 481; Baskervill, *Jig*, p. 301), but the evidence is slight.

- 1624, June 12—"A new play called *A Game at Chess* written by Middleton." (Bald, p. 159, from Malone's MS. note in his copy of the third quarto of the play in the Bodleian Library.) The play was apparently not performed until its famous run in August.
- 1624, Oct. 19—"Rule a Wife and Have a Wife, by John Fletcher, licensed." (Herbert, p. 29.) Herbert's office-book records the performance of this play at Whitehall 'by the kings company' 26 December 1624. (Ibid., p. 52.)
- 1624, Dec.—On the twentieth of December the players apologized to Herbert for acting *The Spanish Viceroy* 'not long since' without a license.¹ (Ibid., p. 21.)
- 1624/5, Feb. 8—"For the king's company. An olde play called *The Honest Man's Fortune*, the originall being lost, was re-allowed by mee at Mr. Taylor's intreaty, and on condition to give mee a booke [*The Arcadia*], this 8 Februa 1624." (Ibid., p. 30.)
- 1625/6, Jan. 22—"The Fair Maid of the Inn, by John Fletcher, licensed; acted at the Blackfriars." (Ibid., p. 31.)
- 1625/6, Feb. 3—"The Noble Gentleman, by John Fletcher, licensed; acted at the Blackfriars." (Ibid.)
- 1626, Oct. 11—"The Roman Actor, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company." (Ibid.)
- 1626/7, Jan. 12—"The Cruel Brother, by William Davenant, licensed." (Herbert, p. 31.) The 1630 title-page says that the play was acted at 'Blacke-Fryers: By His Maiesties Seruants'.
- 1627, June 6—"The Judge, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company." (Ibid.)
- 1628, May 6—"The Honour of Women was licensed May 6, 1628." (Ibid.) *The Spanish Viceroy*, or *The Honour of Women* was entered S.R. 9 September 1653; it may be the old *Spanish Viceroy* with an enlarged name, or, more probably, two plays smuggled in by Moseley under one name to save fees. In the former case, it does not belong in this list.
- 1628, Nov. 24—"Ford's play [*The Lovers' Melancholy*] was exhibited at the Blackfriars on the 24th of November, 1628, when it was licensed for the stage, as appears from the office-book of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels to King Charles the First, a manuscript now before me . . . and Jonson's New Inn on the 19th of January in the following year, 1628-9." (Ibid., p. 32.) Professor Adams says that Malone assumed that license and production dates were the same.
- 1628/9, Jan. 19—"The New Inn, by Ben Jonson, licensed." (See item of 24 November 1628.)

¹ This entry does not properly belong in a list of Herbert's licences, since the play was not licensed, but the chief use of such a list is to find the new plays produced by the company, and *The Spanish Viceroy* was such a play.

1628/9, Feb. 9—'Very soon, indeed, after the ill success of Jonson's piece [*The New Inn*], the King's Company brought out at the same theatre [Blackfriars] a new play called *The Love-sick Maid, or the Honour of Young Ladies*, which was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert on the 9th of February, 1628/9, and acted with extraordinary applause. This play, which was written by Jonson's own servant, Richard Brome, was so popular, that the managers of the King's Company, on the 10th of March, presented the Master of the Revels with the sum of two pounds, "on the good success of *The Honour of Ladies*," the only instance I have met with of such a compliment being paid him' (Ibid.)

1629, June 8—'*The Picture*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid.)

1629, July 29—'*The Northern Lass*, which was acted by the King's Company on the 29th of July, 1629.' (Ibid.)

1629, Oct. 2—'*The Just Italian*, by William Davenant, licensed.' (Ibid.) The 1630 title-page says that the play was presented at 'Blacke Friers, By his Maiesties Seruants'.

1629, Nov. 3—'*Minerva's Sacrifice*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid., p. 33.)

1630/1, Jan. 11—Herbert refused to license a play of Massinger's on this date "'because itt did contain dangerous matter, as the deposing of Sebastian king of Portugal, by Philip the [Second,] and ther being a peace sworn twixte the kings of England and Spayne"' (*Herbert*, pp. 19, 33 and n. 4.) This play was revised and licensed four months later as *Believe as You List* (see Sisson's edition of the play).

1630/1, Mar. 11—'*The Emperor of the East*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (*Herbert*, p. 33.)

1631, May 7—'*Believe as You List*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid.) See 11 January 1630/1

1631, June 13—'*The Unfortunate Piety*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid.)

1632, May 25—'*The City Madam*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid., p. 34.)

1632, Oct. 12—"Received of Knight [book-keeper for the King's men], for allowing of Ben Johnsons play called *Humours Reconcil'd, or the Magnetick Lady*, to bee acted, this 12th of Octob. 1632, 2l. o. o.'" (Ibid.)

1632/3, Jan. 14—The following statement is found in Fleay, *Biog. Chron.* ii. 278: '1633, Jan. 14. *The Corporal* was licensed for acting at Blackfriars by the King's men.' Similar information is contained in Hazlitt, *Manual*, p. 50: 'In Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book, under date of January 14, 1632, there is an entry of a payment of £2, or 40s., to the King's Company, for allowing the performance of it [*The Corporal*] by my Lord of

Essex his servants.' Though no such entry is to be found in the standard sources of information on Herbert's office-book, I do not doubt that Fleay and Hazlitt had authority for their statements, though one or both of them copied carelessly. I should surmise that Herbert's date was 14 January 1632/3, that Fleay changed it to modern style and Hazlitt did not. We know from at least two other sources (see below, p. 132) that the play belonged to the King's men, and Wilson's close connexion with the Earl of Essex is well known from his own *Observations of God's Providence, in the Tract of my Life*. Considering that Wilson was a retainer of Essex and that Wilson himself says that he wrote plays for the entertainment of Essex and his relatives (Bliss, *Inconstant Lady*, p. 119), I cannot understand why Essex's servants should have paid the King's men for permission to perform the play even if it was in the Blackfriars repertory; if they did make the payment, I do not understand how it got into Herbert's office-book. It seems suggestive to me that the fee mentioned is Herbert's regular charge for licensing a new play, and that Fleay says that the transaction was an ordinary licensing one. I should like to guess that what Herbert really recorded was his licensing, 14 January 1632/3, to the King's company, of *The Corporal*, a play formerly privately performed by the servants of the Earl of Essex. Such guessing, though a pleasant exercise, is not sufficient to establish another licensing date for the King's company.

1633, Oct. 31—'The Guardian, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Herbert, p. 35.)

1633, Nov. 23—"The Kings players sent me an ould booke of Fletchers called *The Loyal Subject*, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke, 16 Novemb. 1618, which according to their desire and agreement I did peruse, and with some reformatiōs allowed of, the 23 of Nov. 1633, for which they sent mee according to their promise 1l. 0. 0." A note says, 'Malone states that Herbert wrote in the margin: "The first ould play sent mee to be perused by the K. players."' (Ibid.)

1633/4, Jan. 19—'The Wits, by William Davenant, licensed.' (Ibid.) "This morning, being the 9th of January, 1633, the kinge was pleased to call mee into his withdrawinge chamber to the windowe, wher he went over all that I had croste in Davenants play-booke, and allowing of *faith* and *slight* to bee asseverations only, and no oathes, markt them to stande, and some other few things, but in the greater part allowed of my reformatiōs. This was done upon a complaint of Mr. Endymion Porters in December.

"The kinge is pleased to take *faith*, *death*, *slight*, for asseverations, and no oathes, to which I doe humbly submit as my masters judgment; but, under favour, conceive them to be

oaths, and enter them here, to declare my opinion and submission.

"The 10 of January, 1633, I returned unto Mr. Davenant his playe-booke of *The Witts*, corrected by the kinge

"The kinge would not take the booke at Mr Porters hands ; but commanded him to bring it unto mee, which he did, and likewise commanded Davenant to come to me for it, as I believe. otherwise he would not have byn so civill "' (Ibid , p. 22.)

"*The Witts* was acted on tuesday night the 28 January, 1633, at Court, before the Kinge and Queene Well likt. It had a various fate on the stage, and at court, though the kinge commended the language, but dislikt the plott and characters." (Ibid., p. 54.)

1634, May 7—"The tragedy of *Cleander*, by Philip Massinger, was licensed for the King's Company ' (Herbert, p 35) Not extant.

1634, June 6—"A *Very Woman*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company ' (Ibid , p. 36.)

1634, Nov. 20—"Love and Honour, by William Davenant, licensed.' (Ibid) The play was presented by the King's men at court 1 January 1636/7 (ibid., p. 57) and appears in the bill presented by them for plays acted in 1636-7 (ibid., p. 76). 'Malone adds the information: "*Love and Honour* was originally called *The Courage of Love*. It was afterwards named by Sir Henry Herbert, at D'Avenant's request, *The Nonpareilles, or the Matchless Maids*.'" (Ibid., p. 36, n 1)

1634/5, Jan. 10—"The *Orator*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid , p. 36.)

1635, 1 Aug.—"*News of Plymouth*, by William Davenant, licensed.' (Ibid.) This title is in the list of King's plays sent to the Stationers' Company by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, pp. 65-6)

1635, Sept 16—"Received of Blagrove from the King's Company, for the renewing of *Love's Pilgrimage*, the 16th of September, 1635.—£1. 0. 0." (Herbert, p. 36.)

1635, Nov. 16—"The *Platonic Lovers*, by William Davenant, licensed.' (Ibid , p. 37.) The 1636 title-page says that the play was presented at 'Black-Fryers, By his Majesties Servants'.

1636, May 9—"The *Bashful Lover*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company.' (Ibid)

1638, Apr. 16—"The *Unfortunate Lovers*, by William Davenant, licensed ' (Ibid.) The 1643 title-page says that it was acted at 'Black-Fryers; By His Majesties Servants'.

1638, June 5—"Received of Mr. Lowens for my paines about Messinger's play called *The King and the Subject*," 2 June, 1638, 1l. 0. 0."

¹ The wording of the entry and the fee paid indicate that the play was an old one.

- “‘The name of *The King and the Subject* is altered, and I allowed the play to be acted, the reformations most strictly observed, and not otherwise, the 5th of June, 1638.’” (*Herbert*, p. 38)
- 1638, Nov. 17—*The Fair Favourite*, by William Davenant, licensed.’ (*Ibid.*) It was acted at the Cockpit in Court 20 November 1638 by the King’s men, according to their bill for 1638-9. (*Ibid.*, p. 77.)
- 1639, Sept. 25—*Alexius, or The Chaste Lover*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King’s Company.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 38.) *Alexius the Chaste Gallant, or The Bashful Lover*, by Massinger, was entered S.R. 9 September 1653 and probably represents two plays entered on one fee. *The Bashful Lover*, by Massinger, was printed in 1655, *Alexias or Ye Chast Gallant*, by Massinger, appears in Warburton’s list of MSS., and *Alexius* is in the list of King’s plays in 1641. The play is probably lost.
- 1639/40, Jan. 26—*The Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King’s Company’ (*Herbert*, p. 38.)
- 1640, June 1—*Rosania*, by James Shirley, licensed.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 39.) ‘Before August 7, 1641, its title was changed to *The Doubtful Heir*’ (*ibid.*, n. 1), and under this name it was printed in 1652 in *Six New Playes*, whose title-page says it was ‘acted at the Private House in Black Fryers.’ However, in Shirley’s *Poems*, 1646, appears a ‘Prologue at the Globe to his Comedy call’d The doubtfull Heire, which should have been presented at the Black-Friers’.
- 1640, Nov. 10—*The Impostor*, by James Shirley, licensed.’ (*Ibid.*) Printed in 1652 as *The Imposture* (*ibid.*, n. 2) in *Six New Playes*, which were printed as acted at Blackfriars.
- 1641, May 26—*The Politique Father*, by James Shirley, licensed.’ (*Ibid.*) This play is probably to be identified with *The Brothers*, which was printed in 1652 as ‘Acted at the private House in Black Fryers’. For the extended argument, see Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 46-69.
- 1641, Nov. 25—*The Cardinal*, by James Shirley, licensed.’ (*Herbert*, p. 39.) Printed in *Six New Playes*, whose title-page says it was ‘acted at the Private House in Black Fryers’.
- 1642, Apr. 26—*The Sisters*, by James Shirley, licensed.’ (*Ibid.*) Printed in *Six New Playes*, whose title-page says it was ‘acted at the Private House in Black Fryers’.

THE REPERTORY OF THE KING’S MEN, 1616-42

I have tried to include in this list all of the plays acted by the King’s men between 1616 and 1642. The 170 plays which follow probably comprise a majority of those in their repertory, though there are certain to be omissions. These omis-

sions, aside from those for which I may be responsible, fall into three classes. (1) plays, probably very few, which have disappeared without leaving a trace, or at least no trace so far discovered; (2) plays extant, or known at least by title, which afford no clue that they were ever acted by this company; (3) plays known to have been acted by the King's men before 1616 but not known to have been acted 1616-42. This last group is probably the largest of all and almost certainly includes a number of the plays of Shakespeare for which I have been unable to find evidence of performance after 1616.

In making this list, I have included only those plays for which I can find definite evidence indicating performance between 1616 and 1642 at the Blackfriars or at the Globe or at court by the King's company. There may be a few cases (but not more than five or six, I think) in which my evidence for including a play in the repertory of this company will seem inadequate, but I have not included plays without specific evidence, nor, in the great majority of cases, without the direct statement of a contemporary. With each play I have given my evidence for including it in the repertory.

BEAUMONT and FLETCHER.¹ *The Beggars' Bush*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Presented at court by the King's men 27 December 1622 (*Herbert*, p. 49), 30 November 1630 (Folger MS.), 19 November 1636, and 1 January 1638/9 (*Herbert*, pp. 75 and 77). Sir Edmund Chambers thinks that this is the play protected for the King's men by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 under the title *The Beggars*. (M.S.C. i 365.)

— *The Bloody Brother*. 1st ed. 1639; the 2nd ed., 1640, is entitled *The Tragoedy of Rollo Duke of Normandy*, and the title-page says, 'Acted by his Majesties Servants'. Presented at court by the King's men 7 November 1630, 21 February 1630/1 (Folger MS.), and 17 or 24 January 1636/7 (*Herbert*, pp. 76 and 57). Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it at the Globe 23 May 1633. (See Appendix, p. 675.) The players, mostly King's men, were acting it at the Cockpit when that theatre was raided in 1648. (See *ibid.*, p. 695.)

— *Bonduca*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. *Bonduca* is in the list of plays protected by the Lord Chamberlain for the King's men 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Captain*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio. In list of plays protected by the Lord Chamberlain for the King's men 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) 'The Cap-

¹ For the sake of convenience I have followed Greg and Chambers in including all the plays by either Beaumont or Fletcher under the heading BEAUMONT and FLETCHER.

Beaumont and Fletcher (*cont.*)

taine' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, pp. 12-13, and Sir Edmund Chambers, *R.E.S.i.* 480 and 484.)

— *The Chances*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Presented at court by the King's men 30 December 1630 (Folger MS.) and 22 November 1638 (*Herbert*, p. 77) and protected by the Lord Chamberlain for them 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Coxcomb*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Presented at court by the King's men 5 March 1621/2 and 17 November 1636 (Murray, n. 193, and *Herbert*, p. 75) and protected for them by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Custom of the Country*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Performed as Herbert's benefit at Blackfriars 22 November 1628 (*Herbert*, p. 43), presented at court by the King's men 24 October 1630 (Folger MS.) and 27 November 1638 (*Herbert*, p. 77) and protected by the Lord Chamberlain for them 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Devil of Dowgate*. Not extant. Licensed 17 October 1623. 'For the King's Company. An Old Play, called, *More Dissemblers besides Women*: allowed by Sir George Bucke; and being free from alterations was allowed by me, for a new play, called, *The Devil of Dowgate, or Usury put to use*: written by Fletcher.' It is fairly evident that two plays are indicated in this licence. (*Herbert*, p. 26 and n. 3.)

— *The Double Marriage*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for the King's men 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Elder Brother*. 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Blacke-Friers, by his Maiesties Servants'. Presented by King's at court 5 January 1636/7 (*Herbert*, pp. 57 and 76); John Greene saw it acted at Blackfriars in February 1634/5 (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 386), and Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it at the same theatre 25 April 1635. (See Appendix, p. 677.)

— *The Fair Maid of the Inn*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Licensed 22 January 1625/6: '*The Fair Maid of the Inn*, by John Fletcher, licensed; acted at the Blackfriars.' (*Herbert*, p. 31.)

— *The Faithful Shepherdess*. 1st ed. N.D.; 2nd ed. 1629. The title-page of the 3rd ed., 1634, says, 'Acted at Somerset House before the King and Queene on Twelwe night last, 1633. And divers times since with great applause at the Private House in Blacke-Friers, by his Majesties Servants.' Presented at court 6 January 1633/4 'in the clothes the Queene had given Taylor the year before of her owne pastorall' (*Herbert*,

- p. 53). Marmion's verses in the 3rd ed seem to indicate that Joseph Taylor had revised the play, see 'Players'.
- *The False One*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; the cast given in the 1679 folio indicates that the play was acted by the King's men in this period. The play may possibly be the same as 'The Falce Frend' which appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 11, and Sir Edmund Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 481 and 484.)
- *The Honest Man's Fortune*. 1st ed 1647 folio Licensed 8 February 1624/5: 'For the king's company. An olde play called *The Honest Man's Fortune*, the originall being lost, was re-allowed by mee at Mr Taylor's intreaty, and on condition to give mee a booke [*The Arcadia*], this 8 Februa. 1624' (*Herbert*, p. 30) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) The Dyce MS of the play says, 'Plaide in the yeare 1613', and the cast in the 1679 folio seems to be Lady Elizabeth's men of about this time (See Chambers, *E.S.* iii. 227.)
- *The Humorous Lieutenant* 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *The Island Princess*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio. Acted at court St. Stephen's Day (26 December) 1621 (*Murray*, ii. 193, and *Herbert*, p. 49.) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *A King and No King*. 1st ed. 1619; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Globe, by his Maiesties Seruants:' the title-page of the 2nd ed., 1625, says, 'Acted at the Blacke-Fryars, by his Maiesties Seruants'. Presented at court by King's 10 February 1630/1 and 10 January 1636/7. (Folger MS. and *Herbert*, pp. 57, 76)
- *The Knight of Malta*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio. '... ght of Malta' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 33, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 481 and 484) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)
- *The Laws of Candy*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio.
- *The Little French Lawyer*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65.)
- *The Lover's Progress*. 1st ed 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain

Beaumont and Fletcher (*cont.*)

- 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) The identification of this play with *The Wandering Lovers* is generally accepted. (Fleay, *Biog. Chron.* i. 219-20; Oliphant, pp. 239-41; Baldwin, *Organization*, p. 198, Chart III.) Licensed 6 December 1623: 'For the King's Company. *The Wandring Lovers* Written by Mr. Fletcher.' (*Herbert*, p. 27.) It was probably this play which Sir Humphrey Mildmay called 'Lasander & Callista' when he saw it 21 May 1634. (See Appendix, p. 676.) *The Wandering Lovers* was presented by the King's men at court 1 January 1623/4. (*Herbert*, p. 51.)
- *Love's Cure, or the Martial Maid*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65.)
- *Love's Pilgrimage*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. 'Received of Blagrove from the King's Company, for the renewing of *Love's Pilgrimage*, the 16th of September, 1635,—£1. 0. 0.' (*Herbert*, p. 36.) Acted by King's at court 16 December 1636 (*Ibid.*, p. 76.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641, under the title, 'The Louers Pilgrimage'. (See above, p. 66.)
- *The Loyal Subject*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. 'The Kings players sent me an ould booke of Fletchers called *The Loyal Subject*, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke, 16 Novemb. 1618, which according to their desire and agreement I did peruse, and with some reformations allowed of, the 23 of Nov 1633, for which they sent mee according to their promise 1l 0. 0.' (*Herbert*, p. 35.) Presented at court 10 December 1633 (company not named) and 6 December 1636 by King's. (*Ibid.*, pp. 53, 76.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65.)
- *The Mad Lover*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio. Lady Anne Clifford saw it performed at court 5 January 1616/17. (*Diary of Lady Anne Clifford*, p. 47.) Listed in King's bill as performed at court 5 November 1630 (Folger MS) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it 21 May 1639, but he mentions no theatre or company. (See Appendix, p. 678.)
- *The Maid in the Mill*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio. Licensed 29 August 1623: 'For the King's Players; a new Comedy, called, *The Maid of the Mill*; written by Fletcher, and Rowley.' (*Herbert*, p. 25.) Presented at court 29 September 1623 'by the K. company', 1 November 1623 (company not named), and 26 December 1623 'by the K. company'. (*Ibid.*, pp. 50-1.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

- *The Maid's Tragedy*. 1st ed. 1619; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene divers times Acted at the Blackefriers by the Kings Maiesties Seruants'. 'The Maides Tragedy' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 11, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 484.) Presented at court by King's 9 December 1630 and 29 November 1636 (Folger MS. and Herbert, p. 75.)
- *The Martial Maid*. (See *Love's Cure*.)
- *Monsieur Thomas*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Private House in Blacke Fryers', but, under title of *Fathers owne Sonne*, protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (See below, pp. 330-1.) Issued in the Restoration (N.D.) with a new title-page, *Father's Own Son*.
- *The Nice Valour, or the Passionate Madman*. (See Anon., *The Bridegroom and the Madman*.)
- *The Noble Gentleman*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. Licensed 3 February 1625/6. 'The Noble Gentleman, by John Fletcher, licensed; acted at the Blackfriars.' (Herbert, p. 31.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *Philaster*. 1st ed. 1620; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Globe by his Maiesties Seruants'. 2nd ed. 1622; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene diuerse times Acted, at the Globe, and Blacke-Friers, by his Maiesties Seruants'. 'The History of Phil . . . or Love lies a bleed . . .' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 11, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 481 and 484.) Presented at court by the King's company 14 December 1630 and 21 February 1636/7 (Folger MS. and Herbert, pp. 58 and 76.)
- *The Pilgrim*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Presented by King's at court 1 January 1621/2 (Murray, ii. 193) and 29 December 1622 (Herbert, p. 49).
- *The Prophetess*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Performance by 'the kinges company' 21 July 1629 for Herbert's benefit. (Herbert, p. 43.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *The Queen of Corinth*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*. (See *The Bloody Brother*.)

Beaumont and Fletcher (*cont*)

- *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'Acted by his Majesties Servants'. Licensed 19 October 1624 (company not named) (*Herbert*, p. 29.) Presented at court 2 November 1624 'by the kings company' and again 26 December 1624 'by the kings company' (*Ibid.*, p. 52.) John Greene saw it acted at Blackfriars in February 1634/5. (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 386.)
- *The Scornful Lady*. 1st ed. 1616; the title-page says that it was acted by the Children of the Revels. 2nd ed. 1625; the title-page says, 'As it was now lately Acted (with great applause) by the Kings Maiesties seruants, at the Blacke Fryers'. On the morning of 18 October 1633 Sir Henry Herbert ordered the King's men not to perform *The Tamer Tamed*. 'They acted *The Scornful Lady* instead of it.' (*Herbert*, p. 20) Presented at court 27 December 1630 and 6 January 1641/2. (Folger MS. and *Herbert*, p. 58.)
- *The Sea Voyage*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Licensed 22 June 1622: '*The Sea Voyage*. This piece was acted at the Globe.' (*Herbert*, p. 24)
- *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*. First printed in Bullen, *Old Plays* (1882-5), vol. ii. The MS. of this play (B.M. Add. MS. 18653) has the names of ten actors written in the stage directions, five of whom are easily identifiable as King's men; the other names are too abbreviated for certain identification, but they have been conjecturally identified as King's men. (See Greg, *Dram. Doc.*, p. 273) Produced by King's between 14 and 27 August 1619 (*C.S.P., Dom*, 1619-23, p. 71, No. 18, and p. 73, No. 37.)
- *The Spanish Curate*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Licensed 24 October 1622. '*The Spanish Curate*. Acted at Blackfriars.' (*Herbert*, p. 24) Acted at court by King's 26 December 1622, 6 December 1638, and 7 January 1638/9. (*Ibid.*, pp. 49 and 77) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65)
- *Thierry and Theodoret*. 1st ed. 1621; the title-page says, 'As it was diuerse times acted at the Blacke-Friers by the Kings Maiesties Seruants'.
- *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. 1st ed. 1634; the title-page says, 'Presented at the Blackfriars by the Kings Maiesties servants, with great applause'. 'The 2 Noble Kinesmen' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performances. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 13, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 480 and 484.)

- *Valentinian*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)
- *The Wandering Lovers*. See *The Lover's Progress*
- *A Wife for a Month*. 1st ed. 1647 folio; King's cast in 1679 folio. Licensed 27 May 1624: "'For the King's Company, A Comedy, called, *A Wife for a Month*. Written by Fletcher.'" (Herbert, p. 28) Presented 'by the K. players' at court 9 February 1636/7. (Ibid., pp. 58 and 76) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)
- *The Wild-Goose Chase*. 1st ed. 1652; the title-page says, 'As it hath been Acted with singular Applause at the *Black-Friers*'. King's cast in this edition and in 1679 folio. Presented at court 24 January 1621/2 (Murray, ii. 193), given for Herbert's benefit 6 November 1632 (Herbert, p. 44); protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65)
- *The Woman Hater*. 1st and 2nd issues of 1607 say that the play was acted by the Children of Paul's; 3rd ed., 1648, says, 'As it hath beene Acted by his Majesties Servants with great Applause'. A second prologue in the 1649 quarto shows that the play was acted after Fletcher's death (1649 quarto HN.).
- *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*. 1st ed. 1647 folio. On 18 October 1633 Herbert sent 'to suppress *The Tamer Tamed*, to the Kings players'; it was 'an ould play'. He returned the book, purged, 21 October 1633 (Herbert, pp. 20-1) Presented at court 28 November 1633 (company not named). (Ibid., p. 53.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *Women Pleased*. 1st ed. 1647 folio, King's cast in 1679 folio.
- BERKELEY, WILLIAM. *The Lost Lady*. 1st ed. 1638. Presented at court by the King's men 26 March 1638. (Herbert, p. 76)
- BROME, RICHARD. *The Court Beggar*. This play did not belong to the King's men, the title-page of the 1653 edition to the contrary notwithstanding, it belonged to Beeston's Boys. (See below, p. 337.)
- *The Late Lancashire Witches*. See THOMAS HEYWOOD.
- *The Lovesick Maid, or The Honour of Young Ladies*. Not extant. '... the King's Company brought out at the same theatre [Blackfriars] a new play called *The Love-sick Maid, or the Honour of Young Ladies*, which was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert on the 9th of February, 1628-9. ... [It] was written by Jonson's own servant, Richard Brome...' (Herbert, p. 32.) Presented at court by King's 6 April 1629. (M.S.C. ii. 349.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
- *The Northern Lass*. 1st ed. 1632; the title-page says, 'As it

Brome, Richard (*cont*)

hath beene often Acted with good Applause, at the Globe, and Black-Fryers By his Maiesties Servants' Licensed 29 July 1629 '*The Northern Lass*, which was acted by the King's Company on the 29th of July, 1629' (*Herbert*, p. 32) Presented at court by King's 29 November and 28 December 1638. (*Ibid*, p. 77)

— *The Novella*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Five New Playes*, the title-page says, 'Acted at the Black-Friers, by his Majesties Servants, Anno 1632' Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *The Queen's Exchange*. 1st ed. 1657, the title-page says, 'A Comedy Acted with generall applause at the Black-Friers By His Majesties Servants'. Published by Henry Brome, but in his epistle the publisher says that he does not know when the play was written nor *where acted*.

BURROUGHS, — *The Fatal Friendship* Not extant Nothing is known of this play except the entry in the S R to Robinson and Moseley, 4 September 1646 The only reason for thinking that it belonged to the King's men is that this entry seems to concern a group of MSS. belonging to the King's company Of the forty-nine plays entered, forty-six are known definitely to have belonged to the King's men; *The Spartan Ladies* (q.v) probably did; and *The Fatal Friendship* is one of the two remaining plays.

CARLELL, LODOVICK. *Arriragus and Philicia*, I and II. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'As it was acted at the Private House in Black-Fryers by his Majesties Servants'. Presented at court 16 February 1635/6 (company not named), 18 and 19 April 1636, and 26 and 27 December 1636; the April and December presentations are listed in the King's company bill. (*Herbert*, pp. 55, 56, 57, 75, and 76.)

— *The Deserving Favorite*. 1st ed. 1629; the title-page says, 'As it was lately Acted, first before the Kings Maestie, and since publikely at the Black-Friers. By his Maiesties Seruants'.

— *The Fool Would Be a Favorite*. 1st ed. 1657 in *Two New Playes*, with *Osmond the Great Turk*; the title-page says, 'As they have been often acted, by the Queen's Majesty's Servants, with great applause', but since *Osmond* is known to have been a King's play (see below), Mr W. J. Lawrence thinks this play may also have belonged to the King's company. (See *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923.)

— *Osmond the Great Turk, or The Noble Servant*. 1st ed. 1657 in *Two New Playes*, with *The Fool Would Be a Favorite*; the title-page says, 'As they have been often acted, by the Queen's Majesty's Servants, with great applause', but the following

item shows that it was a King's play: 'Item 6 Sept, 1622, for perusing and allowing of a new play called *Osmond the Great Turk*, which Mr Hemmings and Mr Rice affirmed to me that Lord Chamberlain gave order to allow of it because I refused to allow at first, containing 22 leaves and a page. Acted by the King's players . . . 20s.' (W. J. Lawrence quoting Malone, *T L S*, 29 November 1923, p. 820)

- *The Passionate Lovers*, I and II 1st ed. 1655, the title-page says, 'Twice presented before the King and Queens Majesties at *Somerset-House*, and very often at the Private House in *Black-Friars*, with great Applause, *By his late Majesties Servants*'. Presented at court by King's 10 July, 18, 20, and 27 December 1638. (*Herbert*, pp 76-7.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p 66.) Two of Inigo Jones's designs for sets in this play are extant (See *Designs*, p. 118.)

- *The Spartan Ladies*¹ Not extant. The evidence that this play belonged to the King's men is not conclusive, but seems convincing to me. (a) all Carlell's other plays, with the possible exception of *The Fool Would be a Favorite*, belonged to the King's men; (b) Sir Humphrey Mildmay, who saw most of his plays at Blackfriars, saw 'the spartan Lady' 1 May 1634, though he names no theatre nor company, (c) it is in the list of forty-nine plays licensed to Robinson and Moseley 4 September 1646, forty-six of which are known to have been King's plays, and it seems likely that the other three, *The Spartan Ladies*, *The Princess*, and *The Fatal Friendship*, are King's plays, too, (d) *The Spartan Ladies* is found in the list of 108 plays 'formerly acted at the Black-fryers' and allotted to Killigrew in January 1668/9 (Nicoll, pp. 315-16), and since all but five of the 108 (*The Spartan Ladies*, *The Widow's Tears*, *Bartholomew Fair*, *A Tale of a Tub*, and *Cynthia's Revels*) can be shown to have belonged to the King's men, > 1642, it seems likely that these five may have been their property as well.

- CARTWRIGHT, WILLIAM. *The Royal Slave*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'Presented to the King and Queene by the Students of Christ-Church in Oxford. August 30, 1636. Presented since to both their Majesties at Hampton-Court by the Kings Servants.' Acted at court by King's 12 January 1636/7. (*Herbert*, pp. 57 and 76.)

¹ The title appears in the plural in the S.R. list of 1646 and in Killigrew's list of 1668/9; it appears in the singular in Mildmay's diary (see Appendix, p. 676). Dr Greg suggested (*Library*, 3rd Series, II. 240 n) that *The Spartan Ladies* might be another title for *The Deserving Favorite*, but this seems unlikely, as *The Deserving Favorite* was published in 1629, and Mildmay called *The Spartan Lady* a new play in 1634. Of course Mildmay may have been mistaken.

- CAVENDISH, WILLIAM DUKE OF NEWCASTLE *The Country Captain* 1st ed. 1649 with *The Variety*, separate title-page says, 'A comoeдые lately presented By his Majesties Servants at the Blackfryers'. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)
- *The Variety*. 1st ed. 1649 with *The Country Captain*; separate title-page says, 'A comoeдые Lately presented by His Majesties Servants at the Black-Friers'
- CHAPMAN, GEORGE *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*. (See ANONYMOUS PLAYS.)
- *Bussy D'Ambois* 1st ed 1607; the title-page says that it was acted at Paul's. 'D'Ambois' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p 15, and E K Chambers, *RE S.* i. 483 and 484) On 7 April 1634 'Bussy d'Amboise' was played by the king's players on Easter-monday night, at the Cockpitt in court'. (*Herbert*, p. 55) Presented at court again by King's 27 March 1638. (*Ibid*, p 76)
- *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron*. 1st ed. 1608; the title-page says that it was acted at Blackfriars. 2nd ed. 1625; the title-page says, 'Acted lately in two Playes, at the Blacke-Friers, and other publique Stages'.
- *The Wars of Pompey and Caesar*. 1st ed. 1631; 3rd issue, with new title-page, in 1653; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted at the Black-Fryers'.
- *The Widow's Tears*. 1st ed. 1612; the title-page says, 'As it was often presented in the blacke and white Friers'. It was presented at court 27 February 1612/13 by the Children of the Chapel. (Chambers, *E S.* iv 181.) But it is found in the list of 108 plays 'formerly acted at the Blackfryers' and allotted to Killigrew in 1668/9. (Nicoll, pp. 315-16) Since 103 of the list of 108 plays are known from other sources to have belonged to the King's company before the war and 89 of them are known to have been acted 1616-42, it seems likely that the play was a part of the company's repertory in this time.
- CLAVELL, JOHN. *The Soddered Citizen*. First printed by The Malone Society 1935 (1936). The MS. contains a cast of King's men, and one of the revisers was 'Jhon', book-keeper for King's 1625-31.
- DAVENANT, WILLIAM. *The Cruel Brother*. 1st ed. 1630; the title-page says, 'As it was presented, at the priuate House, in the Blacke-Fryers: By His Maiesties Seruants'. Licensed 12 January 1626/7 (company not named). (*Herbert*, p. 31.)
- *The Distresses*. 1st ed. 1673 folio. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

Malone (*Variorum*, iii. 284) and Fleay (*Stage*, p. 361) say this is the same play as *The Spanish Lovers*, licensed 30 November 1639 (no company named) (*Herbert*, p. 38) The identification is accepted by Harbage (*Davenant*, p. 214) and, with less assurance, by Nethercot (*D'avenant*, pp. 173-5).

— *The Fair Favorite* 1st ed. 1673 folio Licensed 17 November 1638 (company not named). (*Herbert*, p. 38) Presented at court by King's 20 November and 11 December 1638 (*Ibid*, p. 77) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *The Just Italian* 1st ed 1630, the title-page says, 'Lately presented in the private house at Blacke Friers' Licensed 2 October 1629 (no company named) (*Herbert*, p. 32.)

— *Love and Honour*. 1st ed. 1649, the title-page says, 'Presented by His Majesties Servants at the Black-Fryers'. Licensed 20 November 1634 (company not named). (*Herbert*, p. 36) Presented at court by King's 1 January 1636/7 (*Ibid*, pp. 57 and 76) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it 12 December 1634, though he does not name the theatre. (See Appendix, p. 676)

— *News from Plymouth* 1st ed 1673 folio Licensed 1 August 1635 (no company named). (*Herbert*, p. 36) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *The Platonic Lovers*. 1st ed 1636; the title-page says, 'Presented at the private House in the Black-Fryers, By his Majesties Servants'. Licensed 16 November 1635 (company not named). (*Herbert*, p. 37.)

— *The Unfortunate Lovers* 1st ed 1643, the title-page says, 'A Tragedie; As it was lately Acted with great applause at the private House in Black-Fryers, By His Majesties Servants'. Licensed 16 April 1638 (company not named). (*Herbert*, p. 37) Presented at court by King's 23 April, 31 May, and 30 September 1638. (*Ibid*, pp. 76 and 77) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *The Wits*. 1st ed. 1636; the title-page says, 'A Comedie, presented at the Private House in Blacke Fryers, by his Majesties Servants'. On 9 January 1633/4 the King corrected Herbert's censoring, and on 19 January 1633/4 it was licensed (company not named) (*Herbert*, pp. 22 and 35) Presented at court 28 January 1633/4 (company not named). (*Ibid*, p. 54) Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it at Blackfriars 22 January 1633/4. (See Appendix, p. 675.)

DAVENPORT, ROBERT. *The History of Henry the First*. Not extant. Licensed 10 April 1624: "For the king's company. *The*

Davenport, Robert (*cont.*)

Historye of Henry the First, written by Dampont [Davenport]; this 10 April, 1624,—1l. o. o.''' (*Herbert*, pp. 27-8) Mr Adams says (*ibid.*, p. 28, n. 1), 'In S R, September 9, 1653, was entered *Henry 1 and Henry 2*, "by Shakespeare and Davenport"; and in Warburton's list we find entered "Henry ye 1st. by Will. Shakespear & Rob. Davenport "'

DENHAM, JOHN. *The Sophy* 1st ed. 1642; the title-page says, 'As it was acted at the Private House in Black Friars by his Majesties Servants'.

DRAYTON, HATHWAY, MUNDAY, and WILSON. *Oldcastle*. 1st ed 1600. Presented by King's at court 6 January 1630/1 and 29 May 1638. (Folger MS. and *Herbert*, p. 76.)

FIELD, NATHAN. *The Faial Dowry*. (See MASSINGER)

FLETCHER, JOHN. (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER)

FORD, JOHN. *Beauty in a Trance*. Not extant. Entered S R. 9 September 1653. Listed in King's bill as performed at court 28 November 1630. (Folger MS) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See above, p. 65)

— *The Broken Heart*. 1st ed. 1633, the title-page says, 'Acted By the Kings Majesties Seruants at the priuate House in the Black-Friers'

— *The Lovers' Melancholy*. 1st ed 1629; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Private Hovse in the Blacke Friars, and publikely at the Globe by the Kings Maiesties Seruants' Licensed 24 November 1628 (Blackfriars named). (*Herbert*, p. 32.)

FORMIDO, CORNELIUS *The Governor*. Not extant.¹ Presented at court 16 or 17 February 1636/7 'by the K. players'. (*Herbert*, pp. 58 and 76.)

GLAPTHORNE, HENRY *Albertus Wallenstein* 1st ed 1639; the title-page says, 'Acted with good Allowance at the Globe on the Banke-side, by his Majesties Servants'.

HABINGTON, WILLIAM. *The Queen of Aragon*. 1st ed 1640. First produced at court 9 April 1640 by the Lord Chamberlain's 'servants out of his own family' (*Herbert*, p. 58), but there is a 'Prologue at the Fryers' and an 'Epilogue at the Fryers', as well as the court prologue and epilogue (1640 quarto B.M.). This play was very elaborately produced at court. Sir Henry Herbert speaks of 'the cloathes and sceanes, which were very riche and curious'. (*Herbert*, p. 58.) For a description of the scenes, see *Designs*, pp. 131-2.

HEYWOOD, THOMAS. *A Challenge for Beauty*. 1st ed. 1636; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene svndry times Acted, By the

¹ Apparently the play called *The Governor* in B.M. Add. MS. 10419 is not this play, for Harbage points out (*Cavalier Drama*, p. 225) that it is dated 1656, and that the Christian name of the author is Samuel.

- Kings Majesties Servants. At the Blacke-friers, and at the Globe on the Banke-side'
- HEYWOOD and BROME. *The Late Lancashire Witches*. 1st ed. 1634, the title-page says, 'A well received Comedy, lately Acted at the Globe on the Banke-side by the Kings Majesties Actors'
- JONSON, BENJAMIN.¹ *The Alchemist* 1st ed 1612 Presented at court 'by the kings players' 1 January 1622/3 (*Herbert*, p 49); given 1 December 1631 by the King's company for Herbert's benefit (*ibid*, p. 44) In a letter of 21 January 1638/9, Mrs Ann Merricke wrote to Mrs Lydall, 'I cu'd wish myselfe with you, to ease you of this trouble, and with-all to see the Alchymist, which I heare this tearme is revis'd.' (*C. M Ingleby, &c., The Shakespeare Allusion-Book* [Oxford, 1932], i 443, from *C.S.P., Dom*) Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it 18 May 1639, but he mentions neither theatre nor company. (See Appendix, p 678.)
- *Catiline* 1st ed 1611; the title-page of the 2nd quarto ed., 1635, says, 'And now Acted by his Maesties Servants with great Applause'. Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it acted at court 9 November 1634, though he does not name the company (See Appendix, p 676)
- *The Devil Is an Ass* 1st ed 1640 folio; separate title-page says, 'A Comedie Acted in the yeare, 1616 By His Maesties Servants'.
- *Epicoene* (See *The Silent Woman*)
- *Every Man in His Humour*. 1st ed. 1601; the title-page says the play belonged to the Lord Chamberlain's men. Performed at court by the King's men 17 February 1630/1 (Folger MS) "'Received of Mr Taylor and Lowins, in the name of their company, for the benefitt of my winter day, upon the second day of Ben Jonson's play of *Every Man in his Humour*, this 18 day of February, 1630 [1630-31]—12l 4s. 0d'" (*Herbert*, p 44)
- *The Magnetic Lady, or Humours Reconciled*. 1st ed 1640 folio. "'Received of Knight [book-keeper for the King's

¹ About 12 January 1668/9, a list of 108 plays 'formerly acted at the Blackfryers & now allowed of to his Ma^{ties} Servants at y^e New Theatre' was registered. (Nicoll, pp 315-16) Since 103 of the 108 can be clearly shown to have been the property of the King's company before 1642, and two others may well have been, there is reason to believe the statement that the entire list had been handed down from the players of Charles I The three plays not accounted for are Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, *Bartholomew Fair*, and *A Tale of a Tub* The first belonged to the Children of the Chapel in 1600, the second to Lady Elizabeth's men in 1614, and the third, according to Sir Henry Herbert, was produced at court by Queen Henrietta's company in January 1633/4. It is quite possible that all these plays had come to the King's men before the theatres had closed, but I hesitate to accept the evidence of the 1668/9 list alone.

Jonson, Benjamin (*cont.*)

company], for allowing of Ben Johnsons play called *Humours Reconcil'd, or the Magnetick Lady*, to bee acted, this 12th of Octob 1632, 2l 0 0." (*Herbert*, p. 34.) "'Upon a second petition of the players to the High Commission court, wherein they did mee right in my care to purge their plays of all offense, my lords Grace of Canterbury bestowed many words upon mee, and discharged mee of any blame, and layd the whole fault of their play, called *The Magnetick Lady*, upon the players. This happened the 24 of Octob 1633, at Lambeth.'" (*Ibid.*, pp. 21-2.) Alexander Gill's verses 'To B Johnson on his Magnetick Lady' (*Jonson Allusion Book*, p. 177) begin,

Is this yr Load-stone Ben that must attract

And none but ye black-friers to foster it?

- *The New Inn* 1st ed 1631; the title-page says, 'As it was neuer acted, but most negligently play'd, by some, the Kings Seruants. And more squeamishly beheld, and censured by others, the Kings Subiects. 1629'. Licensed 19 January 1628/9 (no company named). (*Herbert*, p. 32.)
- *The Silent Woman* 1st ed (?) 1616 folio; the title-page says that it was acted 'By the Children of her Maiesties Revells'. 'the scilent Woeman:' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 15, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 483 and 484.) It is possible, though by no means certain, that the King's men owned *The Silent Woman* by 1619. "'*The Silent Woman* played at Court of St. James on thursday ye 18 Febr. 1635[6].'" (*Herbert*, p. 55) A King's company bill lists it as presented at court again 21 April 1636. (*Law, Forgeries*, p. 39.)
- *The Staple of News*. 1st ed., 1640 folio, separate title-page says, 'A Comedie Acted in the yeare, 1625. By His Maiesties Servants.'
- *Volpone, or The Fox*. 1st ed. 1607; the title-page of the second edition, 1616 folio, says, 'Acted in the yeere 1605. By the K. Maiesties Servants'. 'The Fox', deleted, appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 13, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 484.) *The Fox* was presented at court 27 December 1624 (the company name has apparently mouldered away), and it appears in King's bills for performances 19 November 1630 and 8 November 1638. (*Herbert*, pp. 52 and 77 and Folger

- MS.) Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw 'the fox playe' at Blackfriars 27 October 1638. (See Appendix, p. 678.)
- KILLIGREW, HENRY. *The Conspiracy* 1st ed (unauthorized) 1638. 2nd ed (authorized), with the title *Pallantius and Eudora*, has a preface, 'The Publisher to the Reader', which tells of a reply of Lord Faulkland, 'the first day of the Presentation of this Play at the *Black-Friers*'. John Greene saw it at Blackfriars 6 November 1635. (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 389.)
- KILLIGREW, THOMAS. *The Parson's Wedding* 1st ed. 1664 folio. The fact that the play contains two allusions to the Blackfriars theatre and three allusions to actors at that theatre (Taylor and Hammerton) seems to me good evidence that the play was performed there. The players did not advertise rival companies
- *The Princess* 1st ed 1664 folio. The play was evidently written before the War. (Harbage, *Killigrew*, p. 172.) The slight evidence which connects it with the King's company is its presence in S.R. in a list of forty-nine plays licensed by Robinson and Moseley 4 September 1646. Forty-six of the forty-nine plays are known to have belonged to the King's company, and it seems likely that the other three (*The Princess*, Carlell's *Spartan Ladies*, and Burroughes's *Fatal Friendship* [q v]) did as well.
- MARMION, SHAKERLEY. *The Soddered Citizen*. (See CLAVELL, JOHN.)
- MARSTON, JOHN. *The Malcontent* 1st ed. 1604. The third edition (1604) says, 'With the Additions played by the Kings Maiesties servants'. The evidence for its performance in our period is to be found in John Greene's diary. He saw the play in February 1634/5. Miss Symonds does not indicate whether the play was performed at Blackfriars or the Cockpit, but one would assume that it was at Blackfriars (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 386.)
- MASSINGER, PHILIP. *Alexius* Not extant. On 25 September 1639, '*Alexius, or The Chaste Lover*, by Philip Massinger, licensed for the King's Company' (Herbert, p. 38.) *Alexius* was protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 65.) *Alexius the Chaste Gallant, or The Bashful Lover*, in S.R. 9 September 1653, probably covers two plays (see *The Bashful Lover* below); *Alexias or Ye Chast Gallant*, by Massinger, is in Warburton's list. Sir Edmund Chambers says (*E.S.* iv 2) that the fragment of a play on the loves of Alice and Alexis in the Douce MSS. at the Bodleian seems to have nothing to connect it with Massinger's *Alexius*, that the date 1604 is scribbled among the pages, and that the MS. contains sixteenth-century accounts.
- *The Bashful Lover*. 1st ed. 1655 in *Three New Plays*, whose

Massinger, Philip (*cont.*)

title-page says, 'As they have bene often Acted at the Private-House in *Black-Friers*, by His late Majesties Servants, with great Applause'. Licensed for King's 9 May 1636 (*Herbert*, p. 37); protected for them by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *Believe as You List* B M Egerton MS 2828, first printed 1849 by the Percy Society, vol. 27. The MS. bears Herbert's licence dated 6 May 1631. Numerous slips in the MS. make it perfectly clear that *Believe as You List* is a revision of Massinger's play about Don Sebastian, King of Portugal, which Herbert had refused to license 11 January 1630/1, 'because itt did contain dangerous matter'. (*Herbert*, p. 19) The MS contains the names of seventeen actors of the King's company.

— *The City Madam* 1st ed. 1658; the title-page says, 'As it was acted at the private House in Black Friers with great applause'. Licensed 25 May 1632 for the King's company (*Herbert*, p. 34); protected for them by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

— *Cleander*. Not extant¹ On 7 May 1634, 'The tragedy of *Cleander*, by Philip Massinger, was licensed for the King's Company' (*Herbert*, p. 35.) "'The 13 May, 1634, the Queene was at Blackfriars to see Messengers playe "' 'Malone adds "The play which her majesty honoured with her presence was *The Tragedy of Cleander*, which had been produced on the 7th of the same month."' (*Herbert*, p. 65 and n. 2)

— *The Duke of Milan*. 1st ed. 1623, the title-page says, 'As it hath bene often acted by his Maiesties seruants, at the blacke Friers'.

— *The Emperour of the East* 1st ed. 1632; the title-page says, 'As it hath bene diuers times acted, at the Black-friers, and Globe Play-houses, by the Kings Maiesties Seruants' Licensed 11 March 1630/1 for the King's company. (*Herbert*, p. 33.)

— *The Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo*. Not extant. Licensed 26 January 1639/40 for King's. (*Herbert*, p. 38) *The Prisoner, or The Fair Anchoress* by Massinger was entered S.R. 9 September 1653, but since *The Prisoner*, a tragi-comedy by Massinger (not extant), was also entered 29 June 1660, the first entry probably covers two plays.

— *The Fatal Dowry*² 1st ed. 1632; the title-page says, 'As it hath bene often Acted at the Priuate House in Blackefryers, by his Maiesties Seruants'. Performed at court by the King's men 3 February 1630/1. (Folger MS)

¹ Fleay identifies *Cleander* with *The Wandering Lovers*, *The Lovers' Progress*, and *Lysander and Calista*. But see Oliphant, pp. 239-41.

² According to the 1632 title-page, the play was a collaboration with Nathan Field.

- *The Forced Lady* Not extant. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p 65) *Minerva's Sacrifice*, or *The Forced Lady* by Massinger was entered S.R. 9 September 1653, that this was an attempt to get two plays through as one is proved by the presence of *Minerva's Sacrifice* as a separate play in the protection list of 7 August 1641. *The Forced Lady* was entered a second time in S.R. 29 June 1660. (See *Minerva's Sacrifice* below)
- *The Guardian* 1st ed. 1655 in *Three New Plays*, whose title-page says, 'As they have been often Acted at the Private-House in Black-Friers, by His late Majesties Servants, with great Applause'. Licensed for King's 31 October 1633 (*Herbert*, p. 35.) Presented at court by King's 12 January 1633/4 (*ibid.*, p. 54); protected for them by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p 66).
- *The Honour of Women*. (See ANONYMOUS, *The Spanish Viceroy*)
- *The Judge* Not extant. Licensed for King's 6 June 1627. (*Herbert*, p 31) The S.R. entry for 9 September 1653, *The Judge, or Believe as You List*, is probably an attempt to smuggle two plays through on one fee. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See above, p 66)
- *The King and the Subject* Not extant 'Received of Mr. Lowens for my pames about Messinger's play called *The King and the Subject*, 2 June, 1638, 1l 0 0. The name of *The King and the Subject* is altered, and I allowed the play to bee acted, the reformatiions most strictly observed, and not otherwise, the 5th of June, 1638' (*Herbert*, p 22) Malone says of *The King and the Subject*, 'This title, Sir Henry Herbert says, was changed. I suspect it was new named *The Tyrant*. The play is lost.' (*Variorum*, iii. 230.) But Warburton's list has 'The Tyrant, A Tragedy by Phill Massenger', and a play of the name was advertised in Warburton's sale, November 1759. (See *Herbert*, p 38, n 2)
- *Minerva's Sacrifice*. Not extant. Licensed 3 November 1629 for King's. (*Herbert*, p 33) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See p. 66 above) See *The Forced Lady*, above.
- *The Orator*. Not extant. Licensed for King's 10 January 1634/5. (*Herbert*, p 36.) *The Noble Choice, or y^e Orator* by Massinger was entered S.R. 9 September 1653; *The Noble Choice* is in Warburton's list.
- *The Picture*. 1st ed. 1630; the title-page says, 'As it was often presented with good allowance, at the *Globe*, and *Blacke-Friers* Play-houses, by the Kings Maiesties seruants'. Licensed for King's 8 June 1629. (*Herbert*, p. 32.)
- *The Roman Actor*. 1st ed. 1629; the title-page says, 'As it

Massinger, Philip (*cont*)

hath diuers times beene, with good allowance Acted, at the private Play-house in the *Black-Friers*, by the Kings Majesties Servants' Licensed for King's 11 October 1626. (*Herbert*, p. 31.)

— *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*. (See FLETCHER.)

— *The Tyrant*. (See *The King and the Subject*)

— *The Unfortunate Piety*. Probably not extant, though Fleay (*B.C.E.D.* i 225 and 210) identified it with *The Double Marriage* and *The Tyrant*. *The Italian night-peece, or, the unfortunate piety* appears in S.R. 9 September 1653. If this S.R. identification is to be accepted, the play is probably the one about which Richard Robinson was so enthusiastic when it was in rehearsal. Sir Henry Wotton wrote to Sir Gervase Clifton in an undated letter, 'I should have seen some pictures and other rarities in the house of Robinson, one of the King's players, as to-morrow, who an hour since sent me word that he cannot be at home to receive me, by reason of a new play which they are to repeat to-morrow in the afternoon, and which they are publicly to act on Wednesday—the rarest thing, as he conceiveth, that hath ever been seen on a stage, called *The Italian Night Masque*.' (L. P. Smith, *Sir Henry Wotton*, ii. 333.) *The Unfortunate Piety* was licensed for King's 13 June 1631. (*Herbert*, p. 33)

— *The Unnatural Combat*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by the Kings Majesties Servants at the Globe'.

— *A Very Woman*. 1st ed. 1655 in *Three New Plays*, whose title-page says, 'As they have been often Acted at the Private-House in Black-Friers, by His late Majesties Servants, with great Applause'. Licensed for King's 6 June 1634. (*Herbert*, p. 36)

— *The Woman's Plot*. Not extant. Acted by King's at court 5 November 1621. (Murray, ii. 193.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) Probably the S.R. entry of 9 September 1653, '*A very woman, or, the woman's plot*. by Phill Massinger', indicates two plays rather than alternative titles (see Chambers, *M.S.C.* i. 367).

MAYNE, JASPER. *The City Match*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'Presented to the King and Queene at White-Hall. Acted since at Black-Friers by His Maiesties Servants'.

MIDDLETON, THOMAS. *Anything for a Quiet Life* 1st ed. 1662; the title-page says, 'Formerly Acted at Black-Fryers, by His late Majesties Servants'.

— *A Game at Chess*. 1st ed. 1625; the title-page says, 'as it was Acted nine days together at the Globe on the banks side'. Licensed by Herbert 12 June 1624. (Wilson, 'Crane', p. 209.) Herbert, the players, and the author were censured by the

Privy Council for the political comment of this play in August 1624. (See above, pp 10-15.)

- *Hengist, King of Kent, or The Mayor of Queenborough*. 1st ed. 1661; the title-page says, 'As it hath been often Acted with much Applause at Black-Fryars, By His Majesties Servants' '... Maior of Quinborough or Hengist K. of Kent' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 11, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 480 and 484.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) Bald gives good reasons for thinking that the play was not originally written for the King's men. (*Hengist, King of Kent*, pp xvii-xxi and xxxiv-xxxv)

- *More Dissemblers Besides Women* 1st ed. 1657 in *Two New Playes*. Licensed 17 October 1623 'For the King's Company. An Old Play, called, *More Dissemblers besides Women*: allowed by Sir George Bucke, and being free from alterations was allowed by me, for a new play, called, *The Devil of Dowgate, or Usury put to use*. Written by Fletcher.'" (Herbert, p. 26.) Probably a mistake in transcription of the licences for two separate plays (See *The Devil of Dowgate*) Presented at Whitehall by King's 6 January 1623/4. (Ibid., p 51.) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

- *The Widow*. 1st ed 1652; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted at the private House in Black-Fryers, with great Applause, by His late Majesties Servants'. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641 (See above, p. 66.)

- *The Witch*. Bodleian MS. Malone 12, a transcript prepared for the author by Ralph Crane, is entitled, 'A Tragi-Coomodic Called the Witch, long since Acted, by his Ma^{ties}. Seruants at the Black-Friers Written by Tho. Middleton.' (Greg, *Dram. Doc.*, pp. 358-9.)

NEWCASTLE, DUKE OF. (See CAVENDISH, WILLIAM.)

PEELE, GEORGE. *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*. (See ANONYMOUS.)

SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM. *Cymbeline*. 1st ed. 1623 folio. 'On Wensday night the first of January, 1633[1/4]. *Cymbeline* was acted at court by the Kings players. Well likte by the kinge.' (Herbert, p. 53)

- *Hamlet*. 1st ed. 1603. 'The Tradgedy of Ham . . .' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 11, and E. K. Cham-

Shakespeare, William (*cont*)

bers, *RE S.* i 484.) Presented at court by King's 24 January 1636/7. (*Herbert*, p. 76)

— *Henry IV, Part 1*. 1st ed 1598. "'Upon New-years night, the prince only being there, *The First Part of Sir John Falstaff*, by the kings company. Att Whitehall, 1624[5].'" (*Herbert*, p. 52.) In April 1635 John Greene saw a play at Blackfriars which he called 'Ffalstafe'. (*Symonds*, 'Diary', p. 386.) The play was probably one of the parts of *Henry IV*.

— *Henry IV, Part 2* 1st ed 1600; the title-page says, 'acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants'. '...nd part of Falstaff. ...laid y^eis 7. yer^es' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for performance at court. Sir Edmund Chambers suggests that the mutilated entry originally read,

Second part of Falstaff
not plaid y^eis 7. yer^es,

a particularly tempting emendation, since the last known court performance of *Henry IV, Part 2* occurred about seven years before when both *Sir John ffalstaffe* and *The Hotspur* were presented in the season of 1612-13. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 33, Chambers, *E S.* iv. 180, and E. K. Chambers, *RE S.* i 481, 482, and 484.) The play 'Ffalstafe' which John Greene saw at Blackfriars in April 1635 may have been *Henry IV, Part 2*. (See *Symonds*, 'Diary', p. 386.)

— *Henry VIII*. 1st ed 1623 folio. George Bullen, writing in *The Athenaeum* for 18 October 1879, gave extracts from a news-letter of August, 1628, concerned chiefly with the activities of the Duke of Buckingham. The MS. was the property of Sir Charles Isham, Bt., of Lamport Hall.

'On Teusday his Grace was p'sent at y^e acting of King Henry 8 at y^e Globe, a play bespoken of purpose by himselfe, w^{at} he stayed till y^e Duke of Buckingham was beheaded & then departed.' Later in the letter, under the heading, 'Another Dicto', is the item 'On teusday was a play at y^e Globe of y^e downfall of y^e great Duke of Buckingham, w^unto y^e Savoian Ambassadour, y^e Duke, Earle of Hollande & oth^rs came, yet stayed only y^e disgracing not y^e beheading of y^e great Duke of Buck.'

Bullen thought that because of the prominence given to the downfall of the Duke of Buckingham, the play might have been *Richard III* instead of *Henry VIII*. This conclusion is hardly necessary. Writing of the contemporary Duke of Buckingham, the news-writer would of course have emphasized the part of Buckingham in the play.

- The same items, almost verbatim, are found in a letter from Robert Gell to Sir Martyn Stutville (Halliwell-Phillipps, *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, II. 210) Stutville married the younger sister of D'Ewes step-mother. These sisters were the daughters of Thomas Isham, Esq., of Langport, Northamptonshire (ibid. I. 227 and 247). Evidently the D'Ewes papers came through the Isham family and Halliwell-Phillipps and Bullen were copying the same letter. Halliwell-Phillipps's statement about his material from the British Museum is quite general. Probably he went to Lamport Hall as well, but *The Shakespeare Allusion Book* (1932), I. 337, prints the letter from *Sh. Soc. Paps* (1845), II. 151, as from Harl. MS. 383, fol. 65.
- *Julius Caesar*. 1st ed. 1623 folio. Presented at court by King's 31 January 1636/7 and 13 November 1638. (*Herbert*, pp. 57 and 77.)
- *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. 1st ed. 1602 Presented by King's at court 15 November 1638. (Ibid., p. 77.)
- *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. 1st ed. 1600 Presented by King's at court 17 October 1630. (Folger MS.)
- *Othello*. 1st ed. 1622; the title-page says, 'As it hath benee diuerse times acted at the Globe, and at the Black-Friers, by his Maesties Seruants' Given for Herbert's benefit 22 November 1629 (*Herbert*, p. 44), presented at court 8 December 1636 (ibid., p. 76). Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw 'the More of Venice' at Blackfriars 6 May 1635 (See Appendix, p. 677.)
- *Pericles*. 1st ed. 1609. Performed at court 20 May 1619. (C.S.P., *Dom*, 1619-23, p. 47, No. 46) "'Received of Mr. Benfielde, in the name of the kings company, for a gratuity for ther liberty gaind unto them of playinge, upon the cessation of the plague, this 10 of June, 1631,—3*l*. 10*s*. 0*d*.'"— "This (Sir Henry Herbert adds) was taken upon *Pericles* at the Globe.'" (*Herbert*, p. 64.)
- *Richard II.* 1st ed. 1597. "'Received of Mr. Shanke, in the name of the kings company, for the benefit of their summer day, upon y^e second daye of *Richard y^e Second*, at the Globe, this 12 of June, 1631,—5*l*. 6*s*. 6*d*.'" (Ibid., p. 44.)
- *Richard III.* 1st ed. 1597. "'On Saturday, the 17th of Novemb. being the Queens birthday, *Richard the Thirde* was acted by the K. players at St James, wher the king and queene were present, it being the first play the queene sawe since her M^{ty}s delivery of the Duke of York, 1633.'" (Ibid., p. 53.)
- *The Taming of the Shrew*. 1st ed. 1623 folio; 2nd ed. 1631. The title-page of the latter says, 'As it was acted by his Maesties Seruants at the Blacke Friers and the Globe'. Pre-

William Shakespeare (*cont.*)

sented at court 26 November 1633 (company not named).
(*Ibid.*, p. 53.)

— *Twelfth Night*. 1st ed 1623 folio. 'To John Heminges &c upon a warrant dated 20 April 1618 for presenting two severall Playes before his Ma^y, on Easter Monday Twelfth night the play soc called and on Easter Tuesday the Winter's Tale xx¹' (Cunningham, *Revels*, p. xlv.) 'At Candlemas [2 February 1622/3] *Malvolio* was acted at court, by the kings servants.' (*Herbert*, p. 50.)

— *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER)

— *The Winter's Tale*. 1st ed 1623 folio Acted at court Easter Tuesday, 1618; see *Twelfth Night*, above. (Cunningham, *Revels*, p. xlv.) 'The Winters Tale' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating 1619 or 1620 It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance. (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 13, and E. K. Chambers, *RE S.* 1 480 and 484) "'For the king's players An olde playe called *Winter's Tale*, formerly allowed of by Sir George Bucke, and likewise by mee on Mr. Hemmings his worde that there was nothing profane added or reformed, thogh the allowed booke was missinge, and therefore I returned it without a fee, this 19 of August, 1623 "' (*Herbert*, p. 18) Presented at court by King's 18 January 1623/4 and 16 January 1633/4. (*Ibid.*, pp. 51 and 54.)

SHANK, JOHN. *Shank's Ordinary* Not extant Licensed 16 March 1623/4, 'For the king's company. *Shankes Ordinary*, written by Shanks himself' (*Ibid.*, p. 27.)

SHIRLEY, HENRY. *The Dumb Bawd of Venice* Not extant. 'A Warraunt to y^e Trer of y^e Chamber for y^e payment of x^{li} vnto Iohn Hemings in y^e behalfe of him selfe and y^e rest of his fellowes his Mat^{es} Comaediens for one play called y^e Dumb Baud of Venice by them Acted before his Ma^y on Easter Tuesday. beeing y^e 15th of Aprill. signed the 9th of May. 1628' (*M S.C.* ii 347) Entered S.R. 9 September 1653

— *The Spanish Duke of Lerma*. Not extant. 'The Duke of Lerma or y^e spanish Duke' protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.) Entered S.R. 9 September 1653.

SHIRLEY, JAMES. *The Brothers* 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*;¹ separate title-page dated 1652 says, 'As It was Acted at the private House in Black Fryers'. A play called *The Brothers*,

¹ Professor Nason notes (*Shirley*, pp. 59–60) that in a catalogue bound in with the Hoe copy of *Six New Plays* is an advertisement of the book containing the statement, 'Being all that ever the Author made for the Private house in Black-Fryers'. This volume is now in HN. (146316).

- by James Shirley, was licensed by Herbert 4 November 1626, but this is probably not the play printed in 1653. The Blackfriars play is probably the one licensed 26 May 1641 as *The Politique Father* (For the extended argument, see Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 46-69.)
- *The Cardinal*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*, separate title-page dated 1652 says, 'As It was Acted at the private House in Blackfriars'. Licensed 25 November 1641 (company not named) (*Herbert*, p. 39.)
 - *The Court Secret*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*, separate title-page says, 'Never Acted, But prepared for the Scene at Black-Friers'. In the dedicatory epistle Shirley says, '... it happened to receive both, when the Stage was interdicted'.
 - *The Doubtful Heir*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*, separate title-page, dated 1652, says, 'As It was Acted at the private House in Blackfriars'. Licensed as *Rosania*, 1 June 1640 (*Herbert*, p. 39.) First produced at Dublin under the title of *Rosania, or Love's Victory* (*Ibid.*) 'The doubtfull heire' protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
 - *The Imposture*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*; separate title-page dated 1652 says, 'As It was Acted at the private House in Black Fryers'. Licensed 10 November 1640 (*Herbert*, p. 39.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
 - *The Politique Father*. (See *The Brothers*.)
 - *Rosania*. (See *The Doubtful Heir*.)
 - *The Sisters*. 1st ed. 1653 in *Six New Plays*; separate title-page dated 1652 says, 'As It was acted at the private House in Black Fryers'. Licensed 26 April 1642 (company not named) (*Herbert*, p. 39.)
- SUCKLING, JOHN. *Aglaura*. 1st ed. 1638; 2nd ed. 1646 in *Fragmenta Aurea*; separate title-page says, 'Presented At the Private House in Black-Fryers, by his Majesties Servants'. Presented at court by King's 3 April 1638. (*Herbert*, p. 76.) This was the second performance at court, for Garrard on 7 February 1637/8 wrote about performances at court and at Blackfriars. (*Strafforde's Letters*, ii 150.)
- *Brennorali*. 1st ed. 1646 in *Fragmenta Aurea*, in which a separate title-page says, 'Presented at the Private House in Black Fryers, by His Majesties servants'. This play is published in quarto, N.D., as *The Discontented Colonell*. 'The discontented Colonell' was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)
 - *The Discontented Colonel*. (See *Brennorali*.)
 - *The Goblins*. 1st ed. 1646 in *Fragmenta Aurea*; separate

Suckling, John (*cont.*)

title-page says, 'Presented at the Private House in Black-Fryers, by His Majesties servants'. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See above, p. 66.)

TOURNEUR, CYRIL. *The Nobleman*. Not extant. Entered S.R. 15 February 1611/12, '*The Noble man* written by Cyrill Tourneur', and again 9 September 1653, '*The Nobleman, or Great Man*, by Cyrill Tourneur'. Since both titles of the latter item are in Warburton's list, it probably covers two plays. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

WEBSTER, JOHN. *The Duchess of Malfi*. 1st ed. 1623, the title-page says, 'As it was Presented priuately, at the Black-Friers; and publicly at the Globe, By the Kings Maesties Seruants'. The quarto contains the casts for two performances of the play, one about 1613, the other between 1619 and 1623. The play was presented at court by the King's men, 26 December 1630. (Folger MS.)

WILSON, ARTHUR. *The Corporal*. Not extant, except in two fragments, one at the Bodleian and one in the Forster collection at the Victoria and Albert. On the verso of the last page of the MS. of Wilson's *Inconstant Lady* in MS. Rawl. Poet. 9 at the Bodleian is the following title written in the author's hand: '*The Corporall*. Acted at the Blackfriars' (Bliss, *Inconstant Lady*, p. 107.) Hazlitt says of the play, 'In Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book, under date of January 14, 1632 [32/3?] there is an entry of a payment of £2, or 40s., to the King's Company, for allowing the performance of it by my Lord of Essex his servants.' (Hazlitt, *Manual*, p. 50.) Though the entry is not found in *Herbert*, I see no adequate reason for doubting it. The play was protected for King's 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Inconstant Lady*. Bodl. MS. Rawl. Poet. 9 and 128 and Folger Shakespeare Library, The Lambarde Volume, MS. 1487.2. Printed 1814, P. Bliss, ed. The play is entitled in Bodl. MS. Rawl. Poet. 9, '*The Inconstant Ladie Acted at Blackfriars*'. (Greg, *Dram. Doc.*, pp. 361-2.) A King's company bill lists it as presented at court 30 September 1630. (Folger MS.) John Greene saw the play in March 1634/5. (Symonds, '*Diary*', p. 386.) Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

— *The Swisser*. B.M. Add. MS. 36759; printed 1904, A. Feuillerat, ed. The MS. is entitled, '*The Swisser Acted At the Blackfriars 1631*'. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66.)

ANONYMOUS. *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*. 1st ed. 1654; the title-page says, 'As it hath been very often Acted (with great

applause) at the Privat house in Black-Friers by his late Maiesties Servants'. A King's bill lists 'Alfonso' as presented at Hampton Court 3 October 1630 (Folger MS.) and another King's bill records the presentation of the same play at Black-friers for the Queen and Prince Elector 5 May 1636 (*Herbert*, p. 75). 'Alfonso Emper^{or} of Germany' was protected for the King's company by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641. (See above, p. 66)

- *The Beggars*. Not extant. Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See above, p. 66)
- *The Bridegroom and the Madman* Not extant Protected for King's by the Lord Chamberlain 7 August 1641 (See above, p. 66.) Sir Edmund Chambers suggests (*M S C. i.* 365) that this may be another title for *The Nice Valour, or The Passionate Madman*, first published in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647. It is possible that this play appears as 'the Bridegr . . .' in the list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance (See Marcham, *Revels*, p. 15, and E. K. Chambers, *R E S. i.* 482 and 484.)
- *The Buck Is a Thief*. Not extant "'Upon Innocents night [28 December 1623], falling out upon a Sondag, *The Buck is a Thief*, the king and prince being there By the king's company At Whitehall "' (*Herbert*, p. 51)
- *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* 1st ed. 1598; the title-page of the 1617 ed. says, 'As it was Acted by the Kinges Maiesties Seruants'.
- *The Italian Night Masque*. (See MASSINGER, *The Unfortunate Piety*.)
- *The Judge* (See MASSINGER)
- *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* 1st ed. 1608; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene sundry times Acted, by his Maiesties Seruants, at the Globe, on the banke-side'; this attribution is repeated on the title-pages of the 1612, 1617, 1631, and 1655 editions. Presented at court by King's 3 May 1618 (Cunningham, *Revels*, p. xlv), 15 February 1630/1 (Folger MS.), and 6 November 1638 (*Herbert*, p. 77).
- *Minerva's Sacrifice*. (See MASSINGER)
- *The Pastoral* Not extant under this title, possibly Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*. "'The Pastorall was playd by the king's players on Easter-tuesday night [8 April 1634], at the Cockpitt in court "' (*Herbert*, p. 55) On 6 February 1633/4 Sir Humphrey Mildmay paid two shillings 'for a booke & the play of pastorell'. (See Appendix, p. 675.)
- *The Spanish Viceroy*. Not extant. Eleven King's men signed a submission dated 20 December 1624 for acting "'a play

Anonymous (*cont*)

called *The Spanishe Viceroy*, not being licensed under your worships hande, nor allowd of." They acknowledged their guilt and promised reformation. (*Herbert*, p. 21.) Possibly this play was revised as *The Honour of Women* (licensed 6 May 1628, *ibid*, p. 31), since the S R has an entry of 9 September 1653, *The Spanish Viceroy or the Honour of Women*, but the subtitles in the S R are too likely to cover duplicity to be trusted 'The Hon^r. of Women A C[omedy]. by Massinger' is in Warburton's list

— *The Woman Is Too Hard for Him* Not extant Acted by King's at court 26 November 1621 (Murray, II 193.)

CHAPTER II

THE PALSGRAVE'S OR KING OF BOHEMIA'S COMPANY

[FORMERLY THE LORD ADMIRAL'S AND PRINCE HENRY'S MEN]

This company first appears in the Christmas season of 1576-7, when they performed at court under the title of Lord Howard's men. Several provincial appearances are recorded before their master became Lord Admiral in 1585. Thereafter they are generally called the Admiral's men. They are traceable at court and in the provinces from this year until about 1590, when they amalgamated with Lord Strange's men, though both companies continued to appear separately in the provinces. This company seems to have been most successful, due, apparently, to the talents of Edward Alleyn.

After a financial quarrel with James Burbage of the Theatre, in May 1591, the combined Admiral's-Strange's men left his playhouse for the Rose. Henslowe's diary provides a very full account of their performances during certain periods of their sojourn here. After the plague of 1594 the Admiral's was reconstituted as an independent company and settled to a long period of prosperity under Alleyn and his father-in-law, Phillip Henslowe, the company's landlord and financier. Henslowe's record of receipts, loans, plays and apparel purchased, fees paid, and various dealings with the players and the poets for the next nine or ten years comprises the most complete record we have of the affairs of any company. From 1594 to 1597 the diary provides a record of 728 performances and indicates several weeks' vacation at Lent and during the summer. In this time, fifty-five new plays were produced, about one a fortnight. As a rule, no one play was performed more than once a week, and intervals between performances lengthened with the age of the play. Most plays seem to have achieved a total of from six to seventeen performances.

The principal members of the company in this time were Edward Alleyn, John Singer, Richard Jones, Thomas Towne, Martin Slater, Edward Juby, Thomas Downton, and James Donstone. After the difficulties of 1597 the company was reorganized, and the list of responsible members became Thomas Downton, Richard Jones, Edward Juby, Thomas Towne, John Singer, Robert Shaw, William Borne *alias* Bird, Gabriel Spencer, Humphrey Jeffes, and Anthony Jeffes. Edward Alleyn had retired from the stage.

In the next three years, 1597 to 1600, the diary seems to record about 690 performances, though one cannot be certain, since Henslowe's accounts in these years differ in character from those of 1594-7, being much less specific as to particular performances. In the autumn of 1600 Alleyn returned to the stage, and the company moved across the river into the new Fortune, north-west of the City.

Henslowe's diary suggests that the next three years of the company's history, when they were performing in the new Fortune with the famous Alleyn as their leading actor, were prosperous ones. After

James I came to the throne, the Admiral's men were taken into the service of Prince Henry and thereafter were generally known as the Prince's players. Those who received his livery for the coronation procession of 15 March 1603/4 were 'Edward Allen, William Bird, Thomas Towne, Thomas Dowton, Samuell Rowley, Edward Jubie, Humfry Jeffes, Charles Massey, and Anthony Jeffes'. The new patent of 30 April 1606 names the same players, except that Edward Alleyn is omitted, the list of the company in Prince Henry's Household Book in 1610 names the eight patented members and Edward Colbrand, William Parr, Richard Price ['Priore'], William Stratford, Francis Grace, and John Shank. In 1604 Alleyn seems to have retired from the stage again, though he retained his interest in the company and his proprietorship of the Fortune. The company appears to have continued in prosperity at this theatre, though Henslowe's records diminish after the move to the Fortune and practically cease after 1604.

In 1612 Prince Henry died, and on 11 January 1612/13 the members of the company were patented as the players of the Elector Palatine, or the Palsgrave, who was about to marry Princess Elizabeth. This patent names all the fourteen men of the Household Book list of 1610 with two exceptions, Thomas Towne, who had died, and Anthony Jeffes, who had left the stage to become a brewer. For them are substituted William Cartwright and Richard Gunnell.

OUR knowledge of this company during the years they played for Henslowe is so abundant that all later records of it seem meagre. It is difficult to realize when piecing together for them such poor scraps of information as make up the histories of most of the other companies that they had not dropped into an unaccountable obscurity.

But the Palsgrave's men and their fine theatre must have been one of the sights of London at this time. The Fortune, according to John Chamberlain, was 'the fairest playhouse in this town',¹ and its patrons included nobles and ambassadors.² It is said that the galleries held a thousand people³ and among them 'such a crowd of nobility so very well arrayed that they looked like so many princes listening as silently and soberly as possible'.⁴ Even the foreign visitors who were brought to the play, although they could not understand a word of English, derived entertainment in 'gazing at the very costly dresses of the actors, and from the

¹ See below, p. 141, and the contract for building the Fortune, *Hens. Paps.*, p. 4.

² See below and p. 140.

³ See the very interesting description of the house and the audience in Middleton and Dekker's *Roaring Girl*, I, 1, quoted Adams, p. 279.

⁴ Quoted from 'Diaries and Despatches of the Venetian Embassy at the Court of King James I, in the Years 1617, 1618', translated by Rawdon Brown, *The Quarterly Review*, cii (1857), 416.

various interludes of instrumental music and dancing and singing'.¹

When representatives of the London companies had been called before the Privy Council on 29 March 1615 for playing during Lent, Humphrey Jeffes and Thomas Downton represented the Palsgrave's men.² Probably they were leaders of the company at this time, since the other companies were represented by their most prominent members.³

Apparently part of the company was travelling in the provinces in the summer of 1616, for on 16 July of this year the Lord Chamberlain condemned the use of duplicate patents by travelling companies and specifically mentioned Charles Marshall,⁴ Humphrey Jeffes, and William Parr, who were travelling with an exemplification of the patent of the Prince Palatine's company.⁵

There are no further records of this company until those found in Alleyn's diary for the autumn of 1618.⁶ Apparently at this time Alleyn was in frequent communication with the Palsgrave's men for a purpose. Although the entries in his diary begin at Michaelmas 1617, there are only three notices of the theatre or the company in the first year. They are:

11 Nov 1617—'pd by mortton y^e fortune quitt rent'

22 Mar. 1617/18—'Redman & His wife Cartwright gannell & parr dind w^t vs.'

9 Apr 1618—'water & ale att y^e fortune as you like itt'

But in the two months of September and October 1618 there are six entries concerning the company:

18 Sept. 1618—'Dinner att y^e marmayd in bred street w^t m^r Edmonds m^r bromfeeld Tho: Allen & 5 of y^e fortune company'⁸

13 Oct 1618—'I R^y rent att y^e banksid & fortune.'⁹

¹ Ibid.

² Dasent, *Acts P C*, 1615-16, p. 86.

³ Burbage and Heminges represented the King's men, Beeston and Lee the Queen's, and William Rowley and John Newton the amalgamated Prince Charles-Lady Elizabeth's men.

⁴ Probably the Norwich clerk's rendering of Charles Massey.

⁵ See below, pp. 178-9, and Murray, II 343-4.

⁶ Perhaps it was the Fortune theatre at which the apprentices intended to gather for their raid on the Cockpit and Red Bull on Shrove Tuesday 1617/18, but the warning which the Privy Council sent the Lieutenants of Middlesex sounds rather as if the Fortune Inn were meant. (See below, p. 163.) In any case, the riot seems to have been forestalled.

⁷ Young, II. 56, 73, 79. Warner says that the play title in the last item is an obvious modern forgery.

⁸ Ibid., p. 104.

⁹ Ibid., p. 110.

- 22 Oct 1618—'pd y^e fortune quitt rent by morton—o 1 10 ¹
 23 Oct 1618—'I dind w^t y^e company att y^e fortune ¹
 30 Oct 1618—'I went to London water to y^e fortune . . ²
 31 Oct. 1618—' . . after dinner w^t y^e fortune men att selling
 [sealing] the lease ²

The reason for Alleyn's frequent meetings with his old fellows is not far to seek. Among the papers preserved at Dulwich is the following:

[Abstract] Lease dated 31 October, 16 James I, 1618, from 'Edward Alleyn of dulwich in the Countie of Surrey esquire to Edward Juby william Bird als Bourne ffranck Grace Richard Gummell Charles Massie william Stratford william Cartwright Richard Price william Parre and Richard fowler Gentlemen' of 'All that his great building now vsed for a playhowse and comonly called by the name of the fiortune scituate lying and being betweene whitcrosse street and golding lane in the Countie of Midd in the p[ar]ish of St Giles wthout Creplegate london together wth all lightes waies passages easem^{tes} Coñodities and app^{te}teñunces to the same belonging or app[er]teyning or therewth now vsed occupied or enioyed, together wth one messuage or Teñite therevnto adioynng called the Taphowse nowe in the occupacōn of one Marke Brigham or his assignes, and also one peece of grownd as yt is now impaled conteyning in length east and west Cxxij foote of assize more or lesse & in breadth north & south seaventeene ffoote of assize more or lesse & rangeth wth the passage on the south side of the said playhowse' from the feast of St Michael the Archangel last past before the date above mentioned for the term of 31 years for the yearly rent of £200 payable quarterly, 'And also two rundlettes of wyne the one sack and the other Clarett of ten shillings a peece price to be deliuered at the feast of Christmas yearely', with provision that if the said Edward Alleyn die within the term of 31 years the rent be reduced to £120 for the residue; the lessees convenanting 'that they nor any of them their executors administrators or assignes shall not at any tyme hereafter alter transpose or otherwise Convert the said playhowse to any other vse or vses then as the same is now vsed', the lessees to receive a rent of 24s yearly to be reduced to 4s at Alleyns death, due from John Russell on a lease for 99 years, dated 20 June 1617, of a tenement of two rooms adjoining the playhouse. Sealed, five out of the ten seals remaining, and signed

'Edward Juby
 R Gunll[?]
 william cartwright
 Richard fowler';

W birde
 Charles massye
 Richard Price

ffrank Grace
 william stratford
 William Parr

¹ Young, u. 111.

² Ibid., p. 112.

witnessed on back.

'Sealed and deliured in the p^resence of vs Leonell Tychebourne
Tho Downton Geo Brome'

and endorsed by Alleyn 'The counterp[ar]te of the lease of the
ffortune playhowse, rent 200^l at 4 feastes or wthin 3 . weekes. &
2 rundlettes of wyne at Christmas/''

Probably the signing of this lease signaled a more independent organization of the company—perhaps on the lines of the King's men—and Alleyn's gradual retirement from theatrical affairs

The make-up of the company at this date is worth noting. The lease is signed by nine of the players named in the patent of 1612-13 and Richard Fowler, who makes his first appearance as a player here. Thus five of the men named in the patent have dropped out. Thomas Downton, the old leader, had had the good fortune to find a vintner's widow and had deserted the stage.² It is interesting to note, however, that he witnessed the lease. Perhaps it was difficult to break old ties. Humphrey Jeffes had died only two months before.³ John Shank had probably joined the King's men, with whom he appeared four or five months later.⁴ What had become of Samuel Rowley and Edward Colborne we do not know, though Colborne continued to live in the parish of the Fortune theatre.⁵

After this event, the references to the theatre and players in Alleyn's diary are again less frequent.

8 Jan. 1618/19—'I went to London to R/ rents . . .
ale w^t them att y^e fortune 0 0 3'⁶
12 Jan 1618/19—'I went to y^e fortune to R/ rent.'⁷
15 Apr. 1619—'water from y^e fortune 0 0 4'⁸
11 July 1619—'Ther dind w^t vs will borne & His
wife m^r borne a surgian.'⁹
26 July 1619—'I went to y^e fortune w^t m^r Scott
wher my mare wase atached.'¹⁰

¹ *Hens. Paps.*, pp 27-8.

² See Players.

³ He was buried 21 August 1618. See 'Players'.

⁴ On 27 March 1619. See 'Players'.

⁵ See 'Players'.

⁶ Young, II 122

⁷ *Ibid* Not long after this, the theatres were closed in mourning for Queen Anne. She died 2 March 1618/19 and was buried 13 May 1619. Presumably the theatres were closed throughout this period (See above, p. 6.)

⁸ Young, II, 130.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 142.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p 146.

- 15 Aug. 1619—'Ther dind wt vs m^r Taylore m^r gunell His wife & daughter franc grace.'¹
- 9 Apr. 1620—'Ther dind wt vs m^r gunnell Cartwright parr & price y^e King of bohemes men '²
- 12 Apr. 1620—'pd y^e quitt rent for y^e fortune dwe att michell Last 0 1 10
 pd y^e tyethes for y^e fortune bothes theys by morton 0 5 0³
- 23 May 1620—'pd my fyne being ratett all y^e lands att 65¹ y^e Howses in bushops gate at 20¹ y^e fortune att 20¹ I pd y^e xth peny w^{ch} came to 10 10 0⁴
- 23 Feb. 1620/1—'I went to meet S^r Nic. Stoddard in powles spent att y^e pole Head wt Hym m^r borne & gunell 0 0 6⁵
- 15 Apr. 1621—'borne: massey Cartwright gunnell grace: Hunt⁶ dind Here.'⁷

In the following July we have the record of an event which seems to mark the company as one of the more favoured of the time; at least it indicates that their playhouse had not yet descended to the low state of later years.⁸

On 21 July 1621 the Spanish ambassador visited the Fortune. Mr. Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton, '... the Spanish ambassador, who is grown so affable and familiar, that on Monday, with his whole train, he went to a common play at the Fortune, in Golding Lane, and the players (not to be overcome with courtesy) made him a banquet, when the play was done, in the garden adjoining'.⁹ The condescension of the Spanish ambassador no doubt brought custom to the Fortune. How Cripplegate Without must have been agog at the banquet in the garden!

There are other notes of interest about the company in Alleyn's diary for the last half of this year.

¹ Young, ii. 147. Grace and Gunnell were Palsgrave's men.

² Ibid., p. 174. The Palsgrave was named King of Bohemia in August 1619 and crowned 4 November 1619. His actual reign was four days.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 177.

⁵ Ibid., p. 202.

⁶ As the other five were Palsgrave's men, the implication is that Hunt was too, but there is nothing further to connect him with the company. See 'Players'.

⁷ Young, ii. 204.

⁸ See below, pp. 319-20 and 690-1.

⁹ Birch, *James I*, ii. 270. There may be some relation between this event and the entry in Edward Alleyn's diary for 26 April 1622, 'I dind wt y^e Spanish Embasadore gondomarr' (Young, ii. 235).

12 Aug. 1621—'Mr Edmonds Charles Massey & on
other off y^e compa[n]y dynd Here.'¹

19 Nov. 1621—'giuen charles massye att His playe o 5 o '²

9 Dec 1621—'md this night att 12 of y^e clock y^e
fortune was burnt '³

How complete was the loss occasioned by this fire we learn from other sources. John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton:

On Sunday night, here was a great fire at the Fortune, in Golding Lane, the fairest playhouse in this town. It was quite burnt down in two hours, and all their apparel and play-books lost, whereby these poor companions are quite undone. There were two other houses on fire, but with great labour and danger were saved.⁴

Such a loss was staggering. It meant the complete destruction of the tangible assets of the players. A very cursory glance at Henslowe's diary and inventories⁵ shows how much of their capital was represented by 'apparel and play-books'.⁶ The fire was an even greater calamity to the players now that the loss of the theatre fell upon the company and not entirely upon the owner.

It may well be doubted if the Palsgrave's men ever recovered completely from this blow. Evidence set forth below⁷ suggests that they were struggling desperately in 1623, 1624, and 1625, and that they were too weak to continue as an independent company after the plague of 1625. Other companies had broken upon the infliction of losses less serious than these. But, as we have seen, this troupe of players had long been a successful one, the individual members must have been men of some means, and—most

¹ Young, ii 216. This is an even more definite implication that Edmonds was a Palsgrave's man than the one on p. 137. Perhaps 'Mr Edmonds' was the John Edmonds who had been an apprentice in the King's company and later a member of Queen Anne's until her death in 1619. See 'Players'.

² Young, ii. 224. Nothing is known of Massey's play.

³ Ibid., p. 225.

⁴ Birch, *James I*, ii. 280. Howes says, '... about foure yeeres after [the burning of the Globe], a fayre strong new built Play-house, near *Goulding-lane* called the Fortune, by negligence of a candle, cleane burnt to the ground but shortly rebuilt farre fairer' (Stowe, p. 1004).

⁵ See especially the inventory of apparel, *Hens. Paps*, pp. 52-5.

⁶ This fire probably accounts in a large part for the paucity of Palsgrave's plays which have come down to us, as compared with the number from other prominent companies, like the King's men and the various organizations controlled by Beeston. See pp. 156-7.

⁷ See below, pp. 149 ff.

important of all—they had an energetic and powerful backer in Edward Alleyn Tentative financial arrangements must have been made, plans drawn, and a contract for the construction of a new theatre let by the 16th of April 1622, for on this date Alleyn notes in his diary, 'Dinner att y^e Hart in Smithfeeld wt y^e builders off y^e fortune' ¹ And he continued actively to push the project, as his diary shows.

- 26 Apr 1622—'water to London 6^d wine wt y^e fortune workmen 12^d 0 1 6¹²
- 28 Apr 1622—'I went to westminster to mete y^e workmen oft y^e fortune spent 0 01 0¹³
- 1 May 1622—'I mett y^e workmen att Ric gunnells water 0 00 6¹³
- 3 May 1622—'I R/ 23¹ off Jacob of y^e Execution & spent att diner wt Hym and y^e fortune builders 0 07 0¹³
- 6 May 1622—'I dind wt y^e fortune workmen att angells & spent 0 01 6¹⁴
- 13 May 1622—'pd y^e first payment for y^e fortune building 25¹ spent 0 1 6¹⁴
- 12 June 1622—'I went to y^e Lord off Arundle showed y^e fortune plott ¹⁵
- 17 June 1622—'I dind att y^e fortune att Smiths Howse spent 0 1 3¹⁶
- 19 July 1622—'I seald y^e Leases off y^e fortune ¹⁷
- 21 July 1622—'Charls massy & His Cosen ned Collins 2 shagbutts & a cornett dind Here.¹⁸
- 15 Aug 1622—'I went to y^e fortune to meet wt m^r thicknis & others ¹⁹
- 18 Aug. 1622—'m^r doughton m^r gwalter m^r gunell m^r garman & wigpitt w. Cartwright m^r (sic) [dind here].¹⁰
- 6 Sept. 1622—'I went to Doc: backer att y^e Charter Howse from thenc to y^e fortune I dind wt m^r axell¹¹ & gaue His wife for ned Lughton 20^s I gaue His man 6^d His mayd 6^d so I 1 0
- 'I seald att vnderwoods y^e fortune Leases & so came Home.¹²

¹ Young, ii. 234.

² Ibid., p. 235.

³ Ibid., p. 236.

⁴ Ibid., p. 237. One wonders if the entry of 4 June, 'I dind wt m^r Hemings', indicates business for the Palsgrave's men.

⁵ Ibid., p. 238.

⁶ Ibid., p. 239. Probably the Henry Smith referred to in the lease. See below, p. 143.

⁷ Young, ii. 244.

⁸ Ibid., p. 246

⁹ Ibid., p. 247

¹⁰ Ibid. All but Downton were lessees of the new Fortune. He was an old leader of the company and still frequently to be found associating with the players.

¹¹ See 'Players'.

¹² Young, ii. 249.

We learn how this project was financed from the papers preserved at Dulwich. Among them is the following lease:

[Abstract] Lease, dated 20 May, 20 James I, 1622, from 'Edward Alleyn of Dulwich in the County of Surrey Esquire' to 'Charles Massy of London gent' of one twenty fourth part of 'all that part or parcell of ground vpon part whereof lately stood a Playhouse or building called the fortune with a Taphouse belonging to the same, a tenement in the occupacōn of Marke Briggum, one other tenement heretofore demised to one John Russell, one other tenement in the occupacōn of William Bird als Bourne, and one other tenement in the occupacōn of John Parson conteyning in breadth from East to West one hundred and thirty foote and in length one hundred thirty one foote and eight inches or thereabout, abutting on the East West North and South as is specified in a plottforme', and also of 'one other messuage or tenement contayning a shopp a Chamber and a Garrett towards the streete, and two Roomes and a Garrett behinde the same, And one yard thereto belonging late in the tenure of william Garrell, and now in the occupacōn of Henry Smith scituate on the North side of the way leading to the said playhouse All scituate lying and being betweene Whitcrosse-streete and Golding lane in the parish of St Giles without Creeplegate in the County of Midd vpon part of which said ground there is intended to be erected and sett vpp a new playhouse', from the feast of St. John Baptist next after the date above mentioned for a term of 51 years, for a yearly rent of £5 6. 11. and in consideration 'that the said Charles Massy is to pay or cause to be paid vnto Anthony Jarman and Thomas Wigpitt for the new building and erecting of a playhouse in Golding lane aforesaid according to a plottforme by them allready drawne for his part the some of fforty one pounds thirteene shillings and foure pence pporcōnably according to the foure and twentieth part thereof, and according to such dayes and tymes as in one paire of Indentures of Articles of agreement indented and bearing date with these presentes made B-tweene Thomas Wigpitt Cittizen and Bricklayer of London and Anthony Jarman Cittizen and Carpenter of London of thone part And Thomas Sparkes Cittizen and Merchantaylor of London William Gwalter Cittizen and Jnholder of London Richard Gunnell of London gent Charles Massy of London gent Richard Price of London gent Adam Jsliipp of London Stationer John ffisher of London Barber Chirurgion Edward Jackson of London gent and ffrauncis Juby of Southwark in the County of Surrey widowe of thother part' the said Charles Massye covenanting to bear a proportionate part of all repairs, and also that he will 'not at any tyme hereafter deuide part alter transport or otherwise convert the . . . edifices and buildings that now are or shalbe

hereafter erected and sett vp as is aforesaid to any other vse or vses then as a playhouse for recreacō of his Ma^{ty} subiectes his heires and successors' Sealed, a fragment of the seal remaining, signed

'Charles massye', witnessed on the back:

'Sealed and deliuered in the p^rsence of

Henr vnderwood

Mathias Alleyn'

and endorsed by Alleyn 'Charles Massyes Counterpane'

From this lease and other papers preserved at Dulwich² we learn that the stock of the new enterprise was divided into shares and half shares, comprising a total of twelve full shares, and leased for a term of fifty-one years to John Fisher, Richard Gunnell, William Gwalter, Adam Islipp, Edward Jackson, Anthony Jarman, Frances Juby, Charles Massey, George Massey, Richard Price, Thomas Sparkes, and Thomas Wiggitt, Alleyn keeping one share himself.³ The ground was leased to these sharers at a rent of £10. 13s. 10d. per share per annum, and the lessors were assessed at £83. 6s. 8d. per share for building the new theatre.

Of the thirteen owners or housekeepers listed above, only Gunnell, Charles Massey, and Price are known to us as Palsgrave's men. The others appear to be simply investors, though two of them were the contractors for the new theatre, and perhaps the merchant tailors, Sparkes and George Massey, expected to, or had already, benefited by furnishing apparel for the players.

We do not know just when the new Fortune was ready for occupancy,⁴ but probably it was in use in the spring of 1623.

¹ *Hens. Paps.*, pp. 28-30

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

³ *Ibid*

⁴ Professor Adams (Adams, p. 286) says, 'June or July of 1623' He gives no source for this statement, and presumably he follows Professor Murray (Murray, 1. 214), who guesses at the date as 31 May 1623 < > 27 July 1623 Murray used these dates because a Palsgrave's company was at Norwich on the former date and Herbert first licensed a play to them on the latter. These dates have no significance. In the first place, secondary or purely travelling companies were so common that these provincial records can seldom be relied upon to indicate the whereabouts of a London company, unless at least one or two actors' names are mentioned. Aside from this fact, the presence of the company at Norwich is no indication that they had to travel because their theatre was unfinished. Indeed, the fact that there are only two known provincial appearances of a Palsgrave's company in 1622 or 1623 or 1624 might better be taken to indicate that the company did *not* tour while waiting for a London theatre. As for the second date, it means even less. Our record of Herbert's entries is notoriously incomplete. Even the dates in this particular section of the diary are questioned (see *Herbert*, pp. 23-4). Besides, the company might have been

At least this is the date indicated in a somewhat cryptic passage in *Vox Graculi, or Iacke Dawes Prognostication* . . . *For this year 1623*. The author in the section entitled 'Of the Spring' has enumerated the wonders to be expected in the spring, he continues

The Dugges of this delicate young bed fellow to the *Sunne* (i.e., the Spring) will flow with the milke of *Profit* and *Plenty*; that (of all other) Some Players (if *Fortune*, turned *Phoenix*, faile not of her promise) will be sucking at them with their fulsome forecastings, for pence and two-pences, like young Pigges at a Sow newly farrowed, for that they are in danger to meet with a hard *Winter*, and be forced to triauell softly on the hoofe.¹

I take this passage to mean that the Fortune theatre, risen from her ashes like the Phoenix, is expected to provide a great increase in income for the players in the spring. The threat about the necessity for the company to travel in the winter is probably only a vague reference to a frequent necessity, though it may have some particular significance.

This assumption that the players will be acting at the Fortune in the spring is made in another passage in *Vox Graculi*. In his prediction for the month of March, Jack Dawe says:

As for thunder and lightning, you shall be sure to haue more store this Moneth, at the *Fortune* in *Golding-lane*, then in *Craues-end Barge*, or in *Westminster-hall*, in a long Vacation.²

The final indication that the Fortune was completed and the players performing there again in the spring of 1623 is to be found in the suit which Gervase Markham brought against the backers of his journey from London to Berwick. The messenger of the court reported that on or about 23 May 1623 he had warned 'Richard Clayton, Richard Grace, William Stratford and Abraham Pedle gent (all Acto^{rs} at the fortune neere Golding lane)' that they must appear in court.³ Presumably Markham had given this address for the players before the messenger sought them out.

This evidence of the opening of the new Fortune in the spring of 1623 is not conclusive, but it seems to me more convincing than the evidence for a later date which has been

acting old plays for months before they had the first new one licensed, or, on the other hand, they might well have licensed a new play in advance of the opening of their theatre.

¹ *Vox Graculi, or Iacke Dawes Prognostication for the Elevation of All Vanity, etc. For this year 1623*. (London, 1623), p. 21.

² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

³ See Appendix, p. 683.

offered before. Even a March opening would have allowed an unusually long period of time for construction—a longer period than was required for the first Fortune or the first or second Globe. Alleyn's diary shows that the work was under way by the middle of April 1622,¹ so that even a March opening would allow more than ten months for construction. The contract for the first Fortune specified that it should be completed in seven months.² The first Globe was finished, or practically so, in five months.³ The second Globe was in use one year after the burning of the first, having taken about eight months in construction if work started immediately after the signing of the new lease on 26 October 1613.⁴ In none of these enterprises was there more need for haste than in that of the new Fortune.

What happened to the Palsgrave's men while they were waiting for a new theatre? We do not know. Perhaps the London company was 'the fortune Players' who appeared at Leicester in January 1621/2,⁵ but as this is the only provincial appearance between April 1621 and May 1623 which can possibly be attributed to the Palsgrave's men, it does not seem likely that they toured all the time that the Fortune was building. One is tempted to conclude that Alleyn found some place for them in London, since it is unlikely that they could remain idle for six or eight months while the other companies were performing and still maintain their organization.⁶

¹ Professor Adams (Adams, p. 284) assumes that construction did not begin until after the signing of the leases on 20 May 1622, since the lease says 'is intended to be erected'. This statement does not necessarily indicate that the building activities had not begun, but only that they had not yet been completed. Certain preliminaries could be eliminated, for Alleyn already owned the ground. The real proof of Adams's error, however, is the diary, which shows that before 20 May Alleyn had not only had seven meetings with the builders and *workmen*, but that he had even made a first payment to the contractors.

² Adams, p. 269.

³ Chambers, *E.S.* II 415.

⁴ Adams, pp. 250-60.

⁵ Murray, II. 314.

⁶ The easy assumption that a company must have been travelling when it was not conspicuous in London is too often made. It is not sufficiently recognized that after the time of Shakespeare's death, at any rate, the London companies took to the road only as a last resort. By so doing they lost their London reputation, their repertory and costumes certainly deteriorated, their living conditions were uncomfortable and often precarious, and, if the sums which were given them as suitable rewards in the provincial towns are any indication, they got a pitifully small return for their efforts. The popular recognition of the fact that the London companies did not tour if they could possibly avoid it is indicated in Lupton's character 'Play-

Whatever they did while waiting for the new Fortune, the company seems to have remained substantially the same. In 1622 (no month or day is given) Sir Henry Herbert listed the London companies in his office-book. Among them are, 'The Palsgrave's servants, Frank Grace, Charles Massy, Richard Price, Richard Fowler, — Kane, Curtys Grevill'.¹ Malono notes that three other names were on a part of the manuscript which has mouldered away. These three were pretty surely Richard Gunnell, who appears with the company both before and after this date and who was a lessee and manager of the new Fortune, and William Cartwright and William Stratford, who also appear both before and after this date.²

Thus a comparison of the members of the company who leased the Fortune in 1618 with the players in Herbert's list in 1622 shows that Edward Juby, William Bird, and William Parr had disappeared, and that Cane and Greville had been recruited. Juby was buried at St. Saviour's Southwark on 20 November 1618;² Parr may also have been dead, since he is last traceable in 1620.² The fate of William Bird is doubtful;² he was probably the man buried at St. Leonard's Shore-ditch in January 1623/4, but his death at this date would not explain his absence from the 1622 list. As Bird had been a player since at least 1597, he may well have retired, but there is no evidence.

Several of the minor functionaries of the company at about this time are known from Gervase Markham's suit against the backers of his journey from London to Berwick. As we have noticed, the court messenger reported that on or about 23 May 1623 he had delivered a summons to 'Richard Clayton Richard Grace William Stratford and Abraham Pedle gent (all Actor^s at the fortune neere Golding Lane)'.³ This affidavit is the only evidence to connect Richard Grace and Clayton with the company, though both are known as

houses' (D. Lupton, *London and the Country Carbonadoed* [1632], reprinted *Harl. Misc.* ix 323).

'Sometimes they [the players] fly into the country. but 'tis a suspicion that they are either poor, or want clothes, or else company, or a new play; or, do as some wandering sermonists, make one sermon travel and serve twenty churches.'

¹ *Herbert*, p. 63. See Lady Elizabeth's company, pp. 183-4, for a discussion of the presence of Cane and Greville in this list.

² See 'Players'.

³ See Appendix, p. 683.

actors residing in the parish of the Fortune. Peadle was a rope dancer.¹

A document in the history of the Palsgrave's men which has been discovered by Mr. Leslie Hotson² adds the final proof that the troupe performing at the new Fortune was essentially the same as the old one. In 1654 Andrew Cane was sued on an old bond of £40 secured by an obligation dated 30 April 1624,

'wherein the said complainant by the name of Andrew Caine of London, gentleman, (by which name the said complainant was then commonly called and known)³ together with Charles Massey, William Cortwright, William Stratford, Richard Price, and Richard Fowler, of London, gentlemen, became jointly and severally bound unto the said Richard Gunnell' in the penal sum of £80 conditioned for the payment of £40 before 1 October, 1624⁴

What this bond actually was we learn from Cane's statement, made in 1654.

no money was ever lent or paid, or ever intended to be secured thereon; but the said bond was only entered into by your orator and the said other obligors, being then the then Prince of Wales his Servants⁵ that played and acted at the Fortune Playhouse in Golding Lane . . . unto the said Richard Gunnell (another of the said Prince's then Servants and Players in the same house) only to oblige themselves to the said Mr. Gunnell to stay and play there: it being usual for them to become mutually bound to each other in like manner, for that they were advised a covenant to play there would not bind them. And it was agreed betwixt your orator, the said other obligors, and the said Mr. Gunnell that no money (notwithstanding the said bond was absolute) should be paid thereon unless your orator and the said other obligors by discontinuance or departure should break the Company (which

¹ See 'Players'.

² Hotson, pp 52-4.

³ In this suit and elsewhere he has been called Andrew de Caine.

⁴ Hotson, p. 53

⁵ This is an odd slip. I dislike questioning the accuracy of contemporary documents, but in this case the evidence is overwhelmingly against Cane, who was writing thirty years after the event and who had, not long after making the bond, become a Prince's player. That he meant Palsgrave's and not Prince's is evident from the facts: (1) We have a full list of Prince Charles's men a year later, a list which includes six men who had been in Prince Charles's for ten years and includes none of those named here. (2) All six of the men in the Fortune bond had recently been Palsgrave's. (3) If these six leaders, including the manager, had deserted the Palsgrave's, the company would undoubtedly have broken up. We know that at least four plays were licensed to the company after this date. There seems no room for doubt that Cane's memory played him a trick and that for the Palsgrave's players he wrote the name of the company to which he had belonged a few years later.

neither of them did), it being also customary for the said Mr Gunnell and the rest of the said late Prince's Servants to do and agree to the like terms.¹

Evidently, then, these seven men were the chief players at the Fortune in 1624. All but Cane had been lessors of the Fortune in 1618, and all had been in Herbert's list of the Palsgrave's servants in 1622 (assuming that our suggestion for the three missing names is correct). The two men who appear in Herbert's list but did not sign the bond are Grace and Greville. Grace had died in St. Giles' Cripplegate about three months before this bond was signed,² and Greville appeared with the Palsgrave's company only the one time.³

But to return to the affairs of the company after their opening at the new Fortune. It will be recalled that in his account of the Fortune fire John Chamberlain had said, 'all their apparel and play-books lost'. If Chamberlain knew whereof he spoke, the company would have had to buy an unusually large number of new plays in the few years after the fire. This is just what happened. From 27 July 1623 to 3 November 1624 we have records of fourteen plays licensed for the Palsgrave's men by Sir Henry Herbert. This is a far larger number of plays than any other Jacobean or Caroline company is known to have had licensed in any period of fifteen months or thereabouts. The nearest approach is the licence of eight plays for the King's men in the eighteen months between 6 May 1628 and 3 November 1629.⁴ The items from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book are as follows:

27 July 1623—'For the Palsgrave's Players, a Tragedy of *Richard the Thrd, or the English Proft*, with the Reformation, written by Samuel Rowley.'⁵

¹ Hotson, p. 52, from a Chancery suit, *And deCaine v. Wm. Wintershall and wife Margaret*.

² See 'Players'.

³ See Lady Elizabeth's, pp. 183-4, and 'Players'.

⁴ See above, p. 102. Six of these King's plays were licensed between 19 January 1628/9 and 3 November 1629. Malone said that the complete MS of Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, now known only in part, showed that the King's company 'between the years 1622 and 1641 produced either at Blackfriars or the Globe at least four new plays every year' (*Herbert*, p. 66). Thus the Palsgrave's licences found in the *incomplete* MS. indicate that the company was licensing about three times as many plays as are shown in most years for the King's company in the *complete* MS., or about five times as many plays as are shown to be the average of the King's men in the *incomplete* MS. (see above, pp. 101-3).

⁵ *Herbert*, p. 24.

29 Oct. 1623—'For the Palsgrave's Players, a new Comedy, called, *Hardshifte for Husbands, or Bilboes the best blade*, Written by Samuel Rowley'¹

19 Nov. 1623—'For the Palsgrave's Players, a new Tragedy, called, *Two Kings in a Cottage*, Written by Bonen.'¹

4 Dec. 1623—'For the Palsgrave's Players; *The Hungarian Lion* Written by Gunnel.'¹

2 Jan. 1623/4—'For the Palsgrave's Company; *The History of the Dutchess of Suffolk*, which being full of dangerous matter was much reformed by me, I had two pounds for my pains. Written by Mr. Drew.'²

26 Jan. 1623/4—'For the Palsgrave's Company; A Tragedy, called, *The whore in grain*.'²

6 Apr. 1624—'For the Fortune, a new Comedy, called, *A Match or no Match* Written by Mr Rowleye'²

17 Apr. 1624—'For the Fortune; *The way to content all Women, or how a Man may please his Wife*. Written by Mr. Gunnel.'³

3 May 1624—'An Old Play, called, *Jugurth, King of Numidia*, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke'⁴

21 May 1624—'For the Palsgrave's Company, a Playe, called, *Honour in the End*.'³

15 Sept. 1624—'For the Palsgrave's Company; A Tragedy, called, *The Faire Star of Antwerp*.'⁵

15 Oct. 1624—'For the Palsgrave's Company, A new Play, called, *The Angell King* '⁵

22 Oct. 1624—'For the Palsgrave's Company; A new Play, called, *The Bristowe Merchant*. Written by Forde, and Decker.'⁶

3 Nov. 1624—'For the Palsgrave's Company, A new Play, called, *The Masque* The masque book was allowed of for the press; and was brought me by Mr. Jon[son] the 29th of December 1624'⁷

15 Mar. 1624/5—'From Mr. Gunnel, in the name of the dancers of the ropes, for Lent, this 15 March, 1624. £1. 0 0.'⁸

19 Mar. 1624/5—'From Mr Gunnel, to allowe of a Masque for the dancers of the ropes, this 19 March, 1624.'⁹

¹ Herbert, p. 26

² Ibid., p. 27.

³ Ibid., p. 28.

⁴ Ibid. Elsewhere Chalmers adds to this item, 'and burnt with his other books'. A play called *Jugurth* was bought by Henslowe in February 1599/1600 (*Hens. D.*, p. 118), and this entry probably indicates a new licence for the Admiral's-Palsgrave's play burned with the Fortune

⁵ Herbert, p. 29.

⁶ Ibid., p. 30.

⁷ Ibid. The '[son]' is Chalmers's addition. Professor Adams suggests that the play was probably 'A Mask' by 'R. Govell' which appears in Warburton's list, and that R. Govell is some one's misreading of R[ichard] Gunnel, who was conspicuous in the company at this time as actor, manager, and playwright. The suggestion seems to me a very likely one.

⁸ Ibid., p. 48.

⁹ *Variorum*, iii. 66.

A further analysis of these records of Sir Henry Herbert yields even more striking evidence of the company's desperate need to replenish their repertory. Only one of the fourteen plays is extant and that in an edition of 1631.¹ When one remembers that the long plague-closing of 1625 was at hand and that the Palsgrave's were unable to continue long, if at all, as an independent company after the plague, thereby presumably throwing many of their plays on the market, one must conclude that the plays cannot have been very attractive to the publishers.

The authors of four of the plays are unknown. Only one, *The Bristowe Merchant*, had authors of reputation, Dekker and Ford. Three others were written by Samuel Rowley, a dramatist not wholly without repute, but certainly not distinguished. Three of the fourteen plays were written by a member of the company, Richard Gunnell.

All these facts taken together clearly indicate that the Palsgrave's men were struggling desperately to get a repertory large enough to keep them going at the new Fortune. Such knowledge of the plays as we have suggests that they were none too fortunate in the pieces they secured. They must have been forced to revive many old plays; *Jugurth*, *King of Numidia*, for instance, seems to have been a very old piece brought out originally twenty-four years before.²

These struggles to keep going at the new Fortune did not last very long, probably less than two years. In the spring of 1625 performances were probably restricted during Lent³ and then prohibited entirely for the period of mourning after the death of King James. By the time of the King's funeral the number of weekly plague deaths was rapidly increasing for the worst plague visitation in the history of the city. Probably acting was restricted on the 2nd of March 1624/5 and prohibited entirely from 27 March or a little earlier until the end of the following November, a period of more than eight months.⁴

There is no known reference to the Palsgrave's company in London after the plague of 1625.⁵ Stage historians have

¹ *The Life of the Dutches of Suffolke*. A. M. for Iasper Emery. Entered S. R. 13 November 1629.

² See above, p. 150, n. 4.

³ See Appendix, p. 654, n. 2.

⁴ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 654 and 657.

⁵ The Palsgrave's players were paid at Bristol in 1630-1 (Murray, II, 219), but, as we have noticed before, the occurrence of the name of a company in provincial records is not good evidence of the presence of the London company.

usually assumed that the company continued to exist until 1631, when the Palsgrave's men became the players of the infant Prince Charles.¹ But the only proof ever offered that the new Prince Charles's company was the old Palsgrave's is the presence of Andrew Cane and Richard Fowler in the new organization, and the fact that about the time Prince Charles's men moved into the Salisbury Court (before 7 December 1631),² the King's Revels, who had previously been performing in that theatre, moved to the Fortune, the one-time home of the Palsgrave's.³ Such evidence carries very little weight. When all traces of a London company disappear for more than two or three years (in this case nearly seven years), the normal conclusion is that the old organization has ceased to exist.

In this particular case, moreover, there are positive indications of the disintegration of the Palsgrave's. The last list we have of responsible members of the troupe occurs in the bond to Gunnell of 30 April 1624: Andrew Cane, Charles Massey, William Cartwright, William Stratford, Richard Price, Richard Fowler, Richard Gunnell. We know quite a little about these individuals. Two of them died before the theatres were reopened after the plague of 1625: Charles Massey was buried at St. Giles' Cripplegate 3 August 1625, and William Stratford was buried at St. Giles' Cripplegate 27 August 1625. A third died about twenty months after the reopening, for Richard Price was buried at St. Giles' Cripplegate 23 July 1627.⁴ Edward Alleyn, who was not a member of the company but who had been of the greatest service to them as a financial backer, died 25 November 1626. The four other players of the bond were still alive in 1631, but there is no evidence to show that they were Palsgrave's men between 1625 and 1631.

Note how misfortunes had piled up for the Palsgrave's men. They had suffered a serious reverse when they lost their theatre, their playbooks, and their costumes in December 1621. The records of their activities in 1622, 1623, 1624, and

¹ Murray, 1. 217, Adams, p. 287, Fleay, *Stage*, p. 330, Thorndike, p. 313.

² See below, pp. 304-7.

³ Professor Murray (Murray, 1. 217) says that the prologue to *Holland's Leaguer*, played by Prince Charles's company at the Salisbury Court theatre in December 1631, shows that the company was an old and not a new one. I have read this prologue repeatedly, but I can find in it no indication that the company was an old one, much less the old Palsgrave's men.

⁴ See 'Players'.

1625 give no evidence of their former prominence but only repeated suggestions that they were struggling to build up a repertory, spending much for new plays, but not getting very good ones. The bond to Gunnell in 1624 suggests that Gunnell was then afraid that the actors would desert the company. His fear indicates that the company was not sufficiently prosperous to insure ready allegiance. The financial drain of the plague of 1625 must have been very great; only the King's men, of all the London companies, can be demonstrated to have maintained their organization intact through it. The Palsgrave's men suffered not only the cessation of income but also the loss by death of two prominent actors. Within a year of the reopening of the theatres they lost their backer, Edward Alleyn, and within twenty months a third prominent actor. When we add to these facts the consideration that there are no records of the company in London after 1625, the conclusion seems to me inescapable that the Palsgrave's men were too weak to resume playing after the long and disastrous plague of 1625, or, if they did resume, lasted only a few months.

This conclusion is strengthened by certain fresh evidence that in 1626 a new and hitherto unknown London company was formed, called the King and Queen of Bohemia's company.¹ The evidence, scanty though it is, suggests that this new company was an amalgamation of the remnant of the once prominent Palsgrave's company and the Lady Elizabeth's or Queen of Bohemia's company, which had been superseded at the Cockpit by the new Queen Henrietta's company during or shortly after the plague of 1625.² This company seems to have played at the Fortune for several years. The new organization was probably considered an amalgamation of the two old ones, since it bore the name of both the old patrons, and since Andrew Cane said in 1654 that none of the prominent Palsgrave's men who signed the bond to Gunnell in 1624 (Massey, Cartwright, Stratford, Price, Fowler, and Cane) left the Fortune or broke the company. The King and Queen of Bohemia's company, though it probably included several former Palsgrave's men and played at the Fortune, obviously was not the old organization. The King and Queen of Bohemia's men may best be studied as a separate company.³

¹ See below, pp. 260 ff.

² See below, pp. 186-8 and 218-22.

³ See below, pp. 260 ff.

LISTS AND TABLES

Since the amount of available material for the Palsgrave's company is so much smaller than that for the King's, it would be sheer formalism to duplicate all the lists which were made for that company. There are no livery allowances for the Palsgrave's men and no court performances, and the number of licences in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book is so small that they can be adequately surveyed in the repertory of the company.

I have thought that there was sufficient material available to make helpful a list of provincial performances, a repertory for the company, and a chart of the actor lists. They have been constructed on the same principles as were the similar charts of the King's men.

References for the actor lists on p. 155 follow:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>M S C</i> 1 275-7. | 7 <i>Herbert</i> , p 63 and above, |
| 2 <i>Dasent, Acts. P C</i> , 1615-16, | p 147. |
| p 86 | 8 <i>Hens. Paps</i> , pp 28-30 and |
| 3. <i>Murray</i> , II 343-4 | 112. |
| 4 <i>Hens Paps</i> , pp 27-8 | 9 See Appendix, p 683 |
| 5 <i>Young</i> , II. 174 | 10. <i>Hotson</i> , p. 53. |
| 6. <i>Ibid</i> , p 204. | |

ACTOR LISTS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	<i>Patent 11 Jan. 1612/13</i>	<i>Represented company before Privy Council 29 Mar. 1615</i>	<i>Touring with duplicate licence July 1616</i>	<i>Lessees of Fortune 31 Oct 1618</i>	<i>Alley's Diary 9 Apr. 1620</i>	<i>Alley's Diary 15 Apr 1621</i>	<i>Her- bert's list 1622</i>	<i>Palsgrave's men who held shares in New Fortune 20 May 1622</i>	<i>Markham's suit calls Fortune Players 23 May 1623</i>	<i>Players' bond at Fortune 30 Apr. 1624</i>
<i>Actors</i>										
Thomas Downton .	1	x	..	2	.	x
William Bird .	2	1	x
Edward Juby .	3	x	2	x	.	.
Samuel Rowley .	4	..	x	5
Charles Massey .	5	x	x	..	.	x	1	.	.	.
Humphrey Jeffes .	6	3	.	x	?	.	.	.
Francis Grace .	7	7	x	x
Wm. Cartwright .	8	9	x
Edward Colborne .	9	..	x	6	.	..	?	.	.	.
William Parr .	10	4	x	x	?	.	x	.
Wm. Stratford .	11	8
Richard Gunnell .	12	10	x	..	3	x	.	.
John Shank .	13	?	4	.	.	.
Richard Price .	14	5
Richard Fowler	6
— Hunt
Andrew Cane
Curtis Greville
Richard Clayton
Richard Grace
Abraham Ieadle

PROVINCIAL NOTICES¹

Date	Place	Source
13 July 1616	Coventry	Murray, ii. 247
c. 19 Apr. 1617	Dover	Ibid., p. 265
29 Sept-25 Dec 1617	Bristol	Ibid., p. 218
1618-1619	Winchester	Ibid., p. 406
15 Apr 1620	Dover	Ibid., p. 266
24 May 1620-21 Apr 1621	Dover	Ibid.
13 Jan 1621/2	Leicester	Ibid., p. 314
31 May 1623	Norwich	Ibid., p. 347
14-28 Apr 1626	Dover	Ibid., p. 267
July-Sept. 1631	Bristol	Ibid., p. 219

REPERTORY OF THE PALSGRAVE'S COMPANY, 1616-25²

BONEN, WILLIAM. *Two Kings in a Cottage*. Not extant. Licensed 19 November 1623: 'For the Palsgrave's Players, a new Tragedy, called, *Two Kings in a Cottage*; Written by Bonen' (Herbert, p. 26)

DRUE, THOMAS. *The Life of the Duchess of Suffolk*. 1st ed. 1631. Licensed 2 January 1623/4 'For the Palsgrave's Company; *The History of the Dutchess of Suffolk*; which being full of dangerous matter was much reformed by me; I had two pounds for my pains' Written by Mr Drew.' (Ibid., p. 27)

FORD and DEKKER *The Bristowe Merchant*. Not extant. Licensed 22 October 1624: 'For the Palsgrave's Company; A new Play, called, *The Bristowe Merchant*. Written by Forde, and Decker.' (Ibid., p. 30.)

GREENE, ROBERT. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. 1st ed. 1594; the title-page of the 1630 edition says, 'As it was lately plaid by the Prince Palatine his Seruants'.

GUNNELL, RICHARD. *The Hungarian Lion*. Not extant. Licensed 4 December 1623: 'For the Palsgrave's Players, *The Hungarian Lion*: Written by Gunnell.' (Herbert, p. 26)

— *The Masque*. (See ANON.)

— *The Way to Content All Women*. Not extant. Licensed 17 April 1624: 'For the Fortune; *The way to content all Women, or how a Man may please his Wife*' Written by Mr. Gunnell.' (Herbert, p. 28.) Both the name of the theatre

¹ All these provincial visits are listed by Professor Murray at the end of his chapter on the Palsgrave's company (Murray, i. 227). All but one of the provincial accounts name the Palsgrave's players or the King of Bohemia's players or the Prince Palatine's players or the Fortune players. The exception is the Dover account for April 1626. Here the record names 'his highnes stage players', probably but not certainly referring to the Palsgrave's company.

² This play list seems to me indicative of the low state of the Palsgrave's men in the last three years of their existence (from which all but three of these plays date). Of the fifteen plays on the list, all but three have disappeared, and of the extant three, two are sixteenth-century plays

and the name of the author indicate that the play was licensed for the Palsgrave's men.

MARLOWE, CHRISTOPHER. *Doctor Faustus*. 1st ed 1604. John Melton says in his *Astrologaster* (1620), p 31, '... there are no such Inflammations seene, except men goe to the *Fortune* in *Golding-Lane*, to see the Tragedie of *Doctor Faustus*.'

ROWLEY, SAMUEL. *Hardshifte for Husbands*. Not extant. Licensed 29 October 1623: 'For the Palsgrave's Players, a new Comedy, called, *Hardshifte for Husbands, or Bilboes the best blade*, Written by Samuel Rowley.' (Herbert, p 26)

— *A Match or No Match* Not extant Licensed 6 April 1624: 'For the Fortune; a new Comedy, called, *A Match or no Match*: Written by Mr. Rowleye' (Ibid., p 27.)

— *Richard the Thurd, or The English Profit*. Not extant Licensed 27 July 1623: 'For the Palsgrave's Players, a Tragedy of *Richard the Thurd, or the English Profit*, with the Reformation, written by Samuel Rowley.' (Ibid, p 24.)

SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM. *As You Like It*. Though this title appears in Alieyn's diary, 9 April 1618, Warner says that it is an obvious modern forgery (Young, ii. 79.)

ANONYMOUS. *The Angel King* Not extant. Licensed 15 October 1624 'For the Palsgrave's Company; A new Play, called, *The Angell King*' (Herbert, p. 29)

— *The Fair Star of Antwerp* Not extant Licensed 15 September 1624 'For the Palsgrave's Company, A Tragedy, called, *The Faire Star of Antwerp*.' (Ibid., p. 29.)

— *Honour in the End* Not extant. Licensed 21 May 1624: 'For the Palsgrave's Company; a Playe, called, *Honour in the End*.' (Ibid., p. 28.)

— *Jugurth, King of Numidia*. Not extant Licensed 3 May 1624: 'An Old Play, called, *Jugurth, King of Numidia*, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke.' (Ibid., p. 28.) For evidence that the play was the property of the Palsgrave's company, see above, p. 150, n. 4

— *The Masque* Not extant Licensed 3 November 1624: 'For the Palsgrave's Company; A new Play, called, *The Masque*. The masque book was allowed of for the press, and was brought me by Mr. Jon[son] the 29th December 1624.' (Herbert, p. 30.) The latter sentence is probably unrelated to the former. (See ibid., p. 41.) A play by 'R. Govell' (Gunnell?) entitled *A Mask* is in Warburton's list. (See ibid., p 30, n. 3.)

— *The Whore in Grain*. Not extant Licensed 26 January 1623/4: 'For the Palsgrave's Company; A Tragedy, called, *The whore in grain*.' (Ibid., p. 27.) Fleay (*Stage*, pp 358-9) identifies this play with *The Whore New Vamped*, which caused the players so much trouble at the Fortune in 1639. (See below, pp. 314-15.)

CHAPTER III

QUEEN ANNE'S COMPANY—PLAYERS OF THE REVELS

An Earl of Worcester's company is traceable in the provinces, but not in London, from 1555 to 1601, though it is possible that there was no such company during the years 1585-9. In 1601 the Earl of Worcester had become Master of the Horse, an appointment which may have had something to do with the appearance of his players in London. They appeared at court in 1602, and in the same year the Privy Council allowed Worcester's and Oxford's players, 'beinge ioyned by agrement togeather in on companie', to act at the Boar's Head. In August of this year the company came to some sort of agreement with Henslowe and probably performed at the Rose. Henslowe's diary contains records of transactions with and for them up to May 1603.

Shortly after the accession of James, this company became the players of Queen Anne. In March 1603/4 we learn from one document; that their theatre was the Curtain and from another that the members of the company were Christopher Beeston, Robert Lee, John Duke, Robert Pallant, Richard Perkins, Thomas Heywood, James Hol, Thomas Swinnerton, Thomas Green, and Robert Beeston. On 15 April 1609 they were granted a patent which names the same players but gives their theatres as both the Red Bull and the Curtain. In the immediately following years they seem to have had a successful London existence and frequently to have toured the provinces. However, there was at least one provincial Queen Anne's company, claiming one or two of the London Queen's men, and it is often impossible to distinguish the provincial from the London company.

Much of our knowledge of Queen Anne's company is derived from Chancery records of the difficulties between the company and Susan Baskerville. It is helpful, therefore, to be with an outline of the case.¹

Thomas Green, one of the leaders of Queen Anne's company, died about 5 August 1612. His will left most of his estate to his wife Susanna, formerly wife of one Browne, whom he made executrix. In June 1613 she married James Baskerville. Part of the estate left her by Green was his share in Queen Anne's company, which, by previous agreement, was valued at £80, and a £37 debt which the company owed him for expenditures in its behalf—a total of £117. After difficulties about this indebtedness and certain in-

¹ In this summary I have made much use of Sir Edmund Chambers' résumé in *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, 236-8. For the documents in full see Fleay, *Stage*, pp. 270-97.

mediate arrangements, a new agreement was made in June 1615 whereby the Baskerviles should invest an additional £57. 10s. in the company and in return receive a pension of 1s. 8d a day for six days in every week that the company played for so long as James or Susan Baskerville should live.

The company failed to live up to this agreement, and in June 1616 another was made whereby the Baskerviles invested £38 more and were given a further pension of 2s. per day, the life of Susan Baskerville's son, Francis Browne, being substituted for that of her husband, James Baskerville, as the term of the agreement. The company again defaulted and also fell behind with the wages of the player William Browne, another son of Susan Baskerville.

On 3 June 1617 a third settlement was made which re-assigned the pensions and substituted the life of William for that of Francis Browne. The players say that this agreement, which was drawn up by Mrs. Baskerville, was worded so as to bind all future members of the company. Since this provision violated one in the agreement of 1616 that the pension should last only so long as four of the signatories should play together, some of the company refused to sign, but others gave bonds for the payment of the pension after Mrs. Baskerville had promised that the provisions of the 1616 agreement should be honoured. The players say that at the time of this new agreement there were 'some others new come into your oratours company, w^{ch} were of other companyes at the tyme of graunting the first annuity'.

In 1623 only three of the 1617 company were still playing together, and Susan Baskerville sued them on their bonds. They applied to Chancery for relief, on the grounds of Mrs. Baskerville's oral promise in 1617, and alleged that she had bribed Beeston, the old manager of the company, to her interest. The Baskerviles seem to have ignored the jurisdiction of the court and failed to appear, according to documents of November 1625 and January 1625/6. Documents of 25 and 26 April 1626 say that they also failed to appear when the case was referred to the Master of the Revels. This policy of delay was successful, for on 9 June 1626 the complaint of the players was dismissed, and on 23 June 1626 they were refused costs.¹

¹ Professor Sisson says (Sisson, *Lost Plays*, p. 121, n. 2) that in 1623 the company broke up entirely, partly because of their obligations to the Baskerviles. His statement is based on further material on the affairs of the company and the Baskerviles which he has discovered at the Record Office, but this material has not yet been published.

From the papers of this suit and from others to be noticed later, it appears that in 1616 Queen Anne's company had already begun to show signs of decay, though some clever person (Beeston seems the most likely) was bleeding the Baskervilles to keep the company going. The Baskerville suit shows that the settlement of June 1616 was necessitated by the failure of the company to live up to a previous agreement. Probably the existence of two separate provincial Queen's companies in 1616 is further evidence of the defection of a large number of actors from the London organization. A letter from the Lord Chamberlain to local officials, dated 16 July 1616, says that Swinnerton and Slaughter [Slater] were touring with separate exemplifications of the London patent and separate companies.¹ Additional evidence of the straits of the company may be seen in a process of 4 October 1616 begun against 'Christofer Beeston and the rest of the players of the Redd Bull' because they were five pounds behind in their contributions to highway repairs in Clerkenwell.² Furthermore, the unpaid bills for which John Smith brought suit against Christopher Beeston in 1619 were contracted between 1612 and 1617,³ and in the same suit John King testified, on 5 May 1620, that 'the sd Company began to separate them selues, three yeares since or there aboutes'.

It may have been in the hope of arresting this decay that Beeston moved the company to his new playhouse in Drury Lane. He had leased the buildings from John Best on 9 August 1616 for a term of thirty-one years from 29 September 1616, and shortly thereafter he must have begun his alterations of the cockpit which Best had built seven years before.⁴ At any rate, his intentions were known by the middle of October, for at a Council held on the 15th of that month the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn decided to send a committee to 'the Queene's Councell, wth others of the Innes of Courte, touchinge the convertinge of the Cocke Pytte in the Feildes into a playe house'.⁵ The fact that the lawyers proposed to consult the Queen suggests that it was also known that the Queen's men were to occupy the new theatre; otherwise it is difficult to see why she should have been approached.

¹ See below, pp. 178-9.

² *Middx. Co. Rec.* ii, 235. Since they were assessed 40s. a year, this process may indicate difficulties of over two years' standing.

³ Wallace, *Three Theatres*, pp. 32-51.

⁴ Hotson, pp. 88-100.

⁵ Baildon, *Lincoln's Inn*, ii, 186.

The committee was not successful, or at least not eventually successful, for the Queen's men did move into the new playhouse a few months later, apparently about the end of February. John Smith says that he delivered materials to them at the Red Bull until 23 February 1616/17,¹ but by 4 March 1616/17 they had moved to the Phoenix. The evidence for their tenancy of the new house on the 4th of March is found in the account of a disaster in the history of the company.

This day was Shrove Tuesday, and the London apprentices, according to custom, were out to enjoy a little destruction. The occasion was evidently a memorable one for the citizens of London. The Privy Council wrote to the Lord Mayor and aldermen:

It is not vnknowne vnto yo^w what tumultuous outrages were yesterday Committed neere vnto the Citty of London in diuerse places, by a Rowte of lewde and loose p[er]sons Apprentices and others, especially in Lincolnes Inne feildes and Drewry Lane, where in attempting to pull downe a Playhowse belonging to the Queenes Mat^s Servants, there were diuerse p[er]sons slayne, and others hurte and wounded, the multitude there assembled being to the number of many thousands as wee are credibly informed.²

A more circumstantial account was written four days after the event, on the 8th of March, in a letter by John Chamberlain:

On the 4th of this month, being our Shrove Tuesday, the 'prentices, or rather the unruly people of the suburbs, played their parts in diuers places, as Finsbury Fields, about Wapping, by St. Catherine's, and in Lincoln's Inn Fields, in which places, being assembled in great numbers, they fell to great disorders, in pulling down of houses, and beating of guards that were set to keep rule, specially at a new playhouse, some time a cockpit, in Drury Lane, where the queen's players used to play. Though the fellows defended themselves as well as they could, and slew three

¹ Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p. 32

² M.S.C. 1 374. The stir which the action of the apprentices at the theatre created is seen in Dekker's *Owles Almanacke* (1618), which was written late in 1617. Dekker says (p. 9), 'Shroue-tuesday fallies on that day, on which the prentices plucked downe the cocke-pit, and on which they did alwayes vse to rifle Madame Leakes house at the vpper end of Shorditch.' Howes thought the event worth recording in his continuation of Stow's *Annales* years later (Stow, p. 1026): 'Shroue-tuesday the fourth of March, many disorderd persons of sundry kindes, amongst whom were very many young boyes, and lads . . . in riotous manner, . . . did beate downe the walles and windowes of many victualing houses, and of all other houses which they suspected to bee bawdie houses. And that afternoone, they spoyled a new Play-house, and did likewise more hurt in diuers other places.'

of them with shot, and hurt divers, yet they entered the house and defaced it, cutting the players' apparel into pieces, and all their furniture, and burnt their play-books and did what other mischief they could.¹

If Chamberlain is to be relied upon, the loss to the players must have been a very serious one and an important factor in the decay of the company. The loss of play-books at this time may well be the reason that so few of the Queen's men's plays have been preserved. It would be interesting to know if any of the actors were among the 'diuerse p[er]sons slayne, and others hurte and wounded'.

It may be a coincidence that four men were charged with destruction committed at the house of Christopher Beeston about this time, but the proximity of the dates and the wording of the charge suggest that the defendants were the rioters and that Beeston's house at this time was the small dwelling-house closely adjoining the Cockpit playhouse. In the Middlesex Special Session of Oyer and Terminer of 20 March 1616/17, 'on the chief movers of a notable riot' fifty persons were charged, most of them with 'riotous assalte and spoyle done upon the dwellinge house of ——' or with 'breakinge the dwellinge house of ——' or with riotous destruction of one sort or another. The first four charged were Henry Baldwin, who pled not guilty when charged 'for breaking the dwellinge house of Christopher Beeston and diuerse goods', and John Grymes, Christopher Longe, and Christopher Lewes, who pled guilty when charged 'for a riotous assalte and spoyle done upon the dwellinge house of Christopher Beeston' and were sent back in irons for various terms, fined, and charged to find sureties for their good conduct.²

The riot in question must surely have been the Shrove Tuesday affair of two weeks before,³ and though it is possible that Beeston's house may have been deliberately attacked

¹ Birch, *James I*, 1 464. The ballad on the riot at the Cockpit (*H E D.P.* i. 386) is a fairly obvious forgery

² *Middx. Co. Rec* 11 219-23.

³ Note that the letter from the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, the first part of which is quoted above, expressly requires 'yo^r Lp: and the rest of the Comissioners of Oyer and Terminer for the Citty of London and Countie of Midlesex, to take it presently into yo^r Care to haue a strict enquiry made for suche as were of yt company aswell Apprentices or others, and furthwth to holde a speciaall Sessions of Oyer and Terminer for that purpose, and there wth severity to proceede against suche as shall be founde Offendo^{rs}. . . .' (*M.S.C.* 1. 375). The session of 20 March 1616/17 carries out these directions.

for some unknown reason, or that it may have suffered when some bawdy house was spoiled, it seems to me much more likely that his dwelling suffered because he was living in the small house adjoining his new playhouse, where we know that William Sherlock lived a few years later.¹ Why the apprentices should be charged with damaging Beeston's house and not with wrecking the theatre, I do not know.

Evidently the company went back to the Red Bull while the Cockpit was being repaired, for the Baskervilles' answer in Chancery says that on 3 June 1617 they were 'now comme, or shortlie to comme from the said Playhowse called the Redd Bull to the Playhowse in Drurie Lane called the Cockpitt'.²

It is probable, however, that the company retained some interest in the Red Bull, for on 2 October 1617 Christopher Beeston, Thomas Heywood, Richard Perkins, Thomas Drew, Richard Harrison, and Ellis Worth petitioned the Sessions of the Peace against the various presentments which had been issued against them for the repair of the highways about that theatre. Further processes against them were stayed.³

On the first anniversary of the spoiling of the Cockpit, Shrove Tuesday 1617/18, the London apprentices intended to repeat their destructive celebrations, supposedly in revenge for the punishment some of their fellows had received for the first riot. On 12 February 1617/18 the Privy Council wrote to the Lieutenants of the County of Middlesex to give warning that certain apprentices had already cast seditious libells into Playhouses in the name of some London fellowe Apprentices, to Summon others in the Skirtes and Con-fynes, to meete at the ffortune, and after that to goe to the Play-houses the Redd Bull, and the Cock Pitt, w^{ch} they haue designed to rase, and pull downe.⁴

This statement apparently indicates that only the Cockpit and the Red Bull were to be raided. It is easy enough to understand what grievances the apprentices were nursing against the Cockpit, but the reasons for their designs on the Red Bull are not so apparent. Perhaps the two theatres were to be attacked as the property of the same company which had offended the apprentices by the vigorous defence which Chamberlain says they put up the year before. Since we hear nothing more of this proposed attack, it is probable that the

¹ Hotson, p. 90. The Cockpit property is discussed on pp. 88-100.

² Fleay, *Stage*, p. 285.

³ *Middx Co. Rec.* ii. 170.

⁴ *M.S.C.* i. 377.

precautionary measures which were advised proved adequate.

The Baskerville lawsuit makes it fairly evident that the company was not any too prosperous during these years. The trouble with the apprentices, the expense of repairing the Phoenix, and the probable loss of business consequent upon their move to the inferior Red Bull theatre must have been bitter blows to the struggling company. But there is evidence that they were little better off even after their return to the Phoenix. In Middleton's *Inner-Temple Masque, or Masque of Heroes*, performed at the Inner Temple in the Christmas celebrations of 1618-19, there is a passage in which Doctor Almanack delivers a charge to Shrovetuesday:

Stand forth *Shrouetuesday*, one 'a the silenc'st Bricke-Layers,
Tis in your charge to pull downe Bawdyhouses,
To set your Tribe aworke, cause spoyle in *Shoreditch*,
And make a Dangerous Leake there, deface Turnbull,
And tickle Codpiece Rowe, ruine the Cockpit, the
Poore Players ne're thru'd in't, a my Cōscience some
Queane pist vpon the first Bricke, . . .¹

Doctor Almanack is obviously commiserating the players not only on their misfortune on Shrove Tuesday, but on their occupancy of an unlucky theatre. The low state of the Queen's men must have been well known if Doctor Almanack could say with point to his Inns of Court audience, 'the Poore Players ne're thru'd in't'. It is amusing if not significant to note that these words in the masque were spoken by Joseph Taylor and that the other speaking parts were taken by other actors from the Prince's men, the company which succeeded the Queen's men at the Phoenix a few months later and with whom Beeston may well have been negotiating already.²

At the death of Queen Anne, on 2 March 1618/19, all the London theatres were closed and presumably remained closed until her funeral on 13 May 1619.³ It is in connexion with this funeral that the next record of Queen Anne's men is found. Among the lists of those granted allowances of black cloth for the funeral procession are seventeen of 'The Q: Plaiers'.⁴ This list obviously includes both the London and

¹ 1619 quarto, HN, B₃^v.

² In November 1619 he said that he had become a member of the Prince's company at the death of Queen Anne (2 March 1618/19). See 'Players'.

³ See above, pp. 6-7.

⁴ See below, p. 171. The list for cloak allowances from the L.C. papers is printed *M.S.C.* ii. 324-5. This list gives sixteen names, but the one which

the provincial players, for Swinnerton and Slater, though frequently found in the provinces as the leaders of a Queen Anne's company, are never mentioned in documents pertaining to the London company. The list shows that Walpole, Reynolds, and Reade had dropped out of the organization. Reade had settled in Ireland,¹ Reynolds appears to have gone to Germany,² but we do not know what had become of Walpole.²

The death of Queen Anne put an end to her London company, though players continued in the provinces as Servants to the Late Queen Anne.³ In November 1619 Beeston said of the company that it had been 'since altered, and the parties separated and dispersed amongst other Companies',⁴ and Perkins, Worth, and Cumber said at the same time that Beeston 'hath of late given over his coate & condicion & separated & Devided himself from these Defendtes . . .' and furthermore that 'there was greate variance & striffe betweene the said Defendtes & the said Beeston vpon there separacion'.⁵ Beeston also said on 23 November 1619 that 'after her Mat^{tes} Decease, he entred into the service of the most noble Prince Charles'.⁶ Evidently Beeston forced the remnants of the Queen's company out of his theatre, the Phoenix, and brought in his new company, Prince Charles's men.⁷

However, a remnant of this company, including Perkins, Worth, and Cumber, who accused Beeston, must have stayed together at the Red Bull. Mr. W. J. Lawrence thinks they were granted a patent as Players of the Revels not long after Queen Anne's death.⁸ This interpretation of the evidence Collier printed (*H E D.P.* 1. 397) as from a Bridgewater House MS. adds a seventeenth, John Garrett. As the editors of the L.C. papers point out, there seems to be no motive for forgery. Several of the actors in the list were primarily provincial players.

¹ Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p. 50.

² See 'Players'.

³ See Murray, 1. 204-5.

⁴ *Smith v. Beeston* in Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p. 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁷ See below, pp. 202-4.

⁸ *M L R.* xiv (1919), 416-18. We may have a reference to this patent in the document from the Signet Office Docquet Book printed *M.S.C.* 1. 284:

Lee et al	A Lycense vnder the signet to Robert Lee and Nicholas Longe w th the rest of their Compame,	} 6-8
Lycence	to play Comedies histories Interludes &c' Sub-	
	scribed by the lo Chamblaine dat' the 24 th febr'	

1619[20]

Sir Henry Herbert evidently referred to this licence in his *Breviat* for Herbert and Thelwall versus Betterton, in 1662 (*Herbert*, p. 111).

'A Grante under the Signett from King James, dated 24 February, 17.

seems cogent. In 1620 *The Two Merry Milkmaids, or The Best Words Wear the Garland* was published as acted by the 'Companie of the Reuels'.¹ On 6 October 1620 *The Virgin Martyr* was licensed,² and it was published in 1622 as 'Acted with great Applause, By the seruants of his Maiesties Reuels'. In 1622 Thomas May's play *The Heir* was published 'As it was lately Acted by the Company of the Reuels', and the title-page of the 1633 edition says, 'As it was Acted by the Company of the Revels. 1620'. *The Tragedy of Herod and Antipater* was published in 1622 as acted by the company of the Revels at the Red Bull, and the title-page of *The Two Noble Ladies* in the Egerton MS. says, 'acted wth approbation At the Red Bull in S^t: Iohns Streete By the Company of y^e Reuells'.³

In the MS. of the Lord Chamberlain's book which Murray reprints from the Inner Temple Library is the following record of payment to this company, 2 March 1621/2.

2^o Marcin. A warrant for allowance of xx^{tie} nobles for one play acted by Ellisworth and his fellowes late servaunts to Queene Anne and now the Companie of the Revells the play called gramarcie witt on of 30th of December 1621 and 3¹ 6^s 8^d by way of reward ⁴

In March 1621/2 there was a mishap on the stage of the Red Bull, and Richard Baxter, one of the actors, wounded a felt-maker's apprentice, John Gill. Baxter was soon given to understand that the honour of the apprentices was not to be lightly treated, in the following letter from Gill:⁵

Mr. Blackster So it is that vppon Monday last it . . . to be uppon your stage intendinge noe hurte to any one, Wheere I was greuously wounded in the head as may appeare, And in the

of his Reigne, to Robert Lea and others to exercise the quality of Playing &c, Provided that all Authority Profitts &c due to the Master of the Reuells shall Remaine see the Grante'

Lee had been a player for twenty-five years and a member of Queen Anne's company since its first patent, and he is mentioned first by Herbert in his list of the Players of the Revels at the Red Bull in 1622 (see below, p. 167), Long always appears as a provincial player (see 'Players'). These facts indicate that the new Revels company may have been an amalgamation of a remnant of Queen Anne's old company and a provincial group. Long appears in none of the other records of a London Revels company, for he died in January 1621/2.

¹ Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, iv. 1105, says it was acted at court during Christmas 1619-1619/20.

² Herbert, p. 29, n. 2.

³ Greg, *Dram. Doc.*, p. 274.

⁴ Murray, ii 192-3.

⁵ Gill is certainly blood-brother to the Knight of the Burning Pestle.

surgeones handes who is to have xs. for the cure, and in the meane tyme, my Mr. to giue me maintenaunce . . . greate losse and hunderance, And therefore in kindnes I desire you to giue mee satisfaccion seeing I was wounded by your owne hand . . . weapon. If you refuse then looke to your selfe and avoyde the daunger which shall this day ensue upon your Company and House For . . . as you can, for I am a Feltmakers prentice and have made it knowne to at the least one hundred and fortye of our . . . who are all here present readie to take revenge vppon you vnles willingly you will give present satisfaction Consider there . . . thinke fittinge, And as you have a care for your owne safeties, so let me have Answered forthwith.¹

The might of the apprentices evidently did not have the desired effect, for Baxter turned the letter over to the authorities of Middlesex, who protected the theatre. We can imagine, however, that the apprentices managed to make Baxter's life upon the stage less happy than it once had been.

On the 10th of May following, Sir Henry Herbert made this entry in his office-book: 'A new Play, called, *The Welsh Traveller*, was allowed to be acted by the players of the Revels'.²

Some time in this year (no day or month is mentioned) Herbert listed in his office-book the leading members of this and the other London companies. Of these actors he writes:

The names of the chiefe players at the Red Bull, called the players of the Revells Robert Lee, Richard Perkins, Ellis Woorth, Thomas Basse, John Blany, John Cumber, William Robbins.³

These players were, on the 8th of July in the same year, authorized to make up a company of children. The warrant for the privy seal is found in the Lord Chamberlain's book in the Inner Temple Library and authorizes

Robert Lee Richard Perkins Ellis woorth Thomas Bass^e. John Blany John Cumber and Will. Robins late Commedians to Queene Anne^e deceased to bring vp Children in the qualitie and exercise of playing Commedyes Histories Enterludes Morrall pastoralis

¹ *Middx. Co Rec* ii. 175-6.

² *Herbert*, p. 23 This date has sometimes been changed to 1623 because of the confusion of the Children of the Revels and the Players of the Revels See below, pp. 168-9.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 63. Though he was evidently not sufficiently prominent in the company to be called one of the chief players by Sir Henry, Richard Baxter was a player at the Red Bull at this time, as the threatening letter from the apprentice shows

Stage plays and such other like . . . to be called by the name of the Children of the Revels . . .¹

Under date of 25 July following, in the same book, is a record of the Lord Chamberlain's signature to this bill,² and there is another record of it in the Signet Office Docquet Book in November³ However, we have no record of the existence of the company. It has been generally assumed that the company of children here authorized is indicated in the various references to the 'Players of the Revels' above. It is most unlikely, however, that the Players of the Revels and the Children of the Revels were the same, since children were not referred to simply as players, and since several of the references to the Players of the Revels antedate the bills for the licence of the Children of the Revels.⁴ Mr Lawrence thinks that the boy company was never formed, and he is probably right.⁵ Sir Edmund Chambers says that the warrant

¹ Murray, II 193-4. In spite of the similarity of the names, this company is not to be confused with 'the Children of the Revels of the late Queene Anna', part of whose licence is copied into the records of the city of Exeter. That licence is dated 31 October 1617, and a continuing allowance for one year is granted by Sir Henry Herbert on 9 April 1624. (The 'late Queene Anna' must be an addition of Herbert or of the provincial scribe, for the original licence is dated nearly a year and a half before the death of the Queen.) Herbert allowed the continuance of the licence to 'the said William Perrie and his associates, vizt, George Bosegrave, Richard Backster, Thomas Band, James Jones, Walter Barrett, James Kneller, and Edward Tobe and the rest of there Companie not exceedinge the number of twentye'. The same original licence is referred to in the Norwich records 24 May 1624, when the clerk recorded that William Perry had brought into court 'an Instrument vnder his maties privie Signet and Signed wth his mat^{es} hand authorisinge him wth Robt Lee Philip Rossiter & their Company as Servants to Quene Ann to play &c Test vltimo octobris Anno xv^o Jacobi Regis' (Murray, II 347). Of these ten men, only Lee is ever found in an official document of the London company. Baxter was apparently playing with them in 1622 when the accident occurred at the Red Bull. There is no adequate evidence that this organization was ever anything but a provincial one, Murray to the contrary notwithstanding (Murray, I 361-3, and II 272-3, 347). A fuller transcript of the Exeter record and a correction of the date will be found in *Hist. MSS. Com., Report on the Records of the City of Exeter*, pp. 171-2.

² The Bill required to be drawne at the Signett office by his Lo^{ps} warrant for Robert Lee Richard Perkins Ellsworth Thomas Bass^e Jo^e Blany John Cumber and William Robins servants to the late Queene Ann^e and now called the Companie of the Children of the Revels was heere signed by his Lo^p being first doqueted by M^r Windebank' (Murray, II 194).

³ 'A Warr^t vnder the Signet to licence Robert Lee Richard Perkins and others Comedians to the late Queene Anne to exercise the quality & Arte of Stage players as they haue bin heretofore accustomed Subscr^d by .L. Chamblaine and by order from him' (*M.S.C.* I. 284.)

⁴ See W. J. Lawrence, *M.L.R.* xiv (1919), 416-18.

⁵ *Ibid.*

under the Signet for the Children of the Revels does not appear to have led to a patent for the company.¹

Perhaps some evidence of the precarious state of the company is to be seen in the order of 2 October 1622 to proceed against the company of the Red Bull for their refusal to repair the footways about the theatre.² Very shortly after this time the company probably broke up; at least it completely disappears. It is suggestive that of the eight plays known to have been acted by the Company of the Revels, three were printed in 1622.

In their Bill of Complaint of 23 May 1623, Worth, Cumber, and Blaney describe the Baskerville agreement of 1617 and then continue, 'Since w^{ch} tyme all your oratours said fellowes that sealed to the said deed of Indenture and bonds are dead, or departed from your oratours to some other company'.³ This statement must have been true, since the Baskervilles did not deny it, and William Browne as a former hired man of the company surely knew the true state of affairs. John Cumber was dead by 16 June 1623, as the Baskerville's Answer shows,⁴ and by August of the same year Prince Charles's men were playing at the Red Bull.⁵ Richard Perkins, one of the leaders of the company, deserted them for the King's men some time in 1623, and he remained a King's man until he joined Beeston's new organization, Queen Henrietta's company, at the Phoenix after the plague of 1625.⁶

¹ *M S C.* 1 261 and 284

² '3 October, 20 James I—Order touching the highways near the Red Bull in Clarkenwell—Whereas Christofer Beeston, Thomas Hayward, Richard Perkins, Thomas Drew, Richard Harrison and Ellis Worth have bene heretofore presented at severall Sessions of the Peace for not repayingne the Highwayes neere the Red Bull in the parishe of Clarkenwell, and afterwards upon their petition, at the Sessions of the Peace holden secundo die Octobris anno Regni Regis Jacobi decimo quinto (viz. 2 Oct 15 James I), the Court taking notice of the great charge they had bene at in repayingne the said waies, It was ordered that further proces shold be staied upon those presentmentes, But forasmuch as the footewaies neere the said Red Bull, which ought to be repaired by the persons aforementioned are nowe very farre out of repaire, and they doe obstinatelie refuse to amende the same, It is therefore Ordered that Proces de Novo be awarded against them upon the former presentmentes.' (*Middx Co. Rec.* II 170) The sessions rolls contain another reference to this difficulty several years earlier in a memorandum of process against persons charged with neglecting to contribute to the repair of the highways: 'Christopher Beeston and the rest of the players of the Redd Bull are behinde five pounds, being taxed by the bench 40s. the yeare by there owne consentes.' (*Ibid.*, p 235)

³ Fleay, *Stage* p 278

⁴ See below, pp. 205-9.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 279.

⁶ See 'Players'.

These various pieces of evidence seem sufficient to indicate that the Queen Anne-Revels organization had gone completely to pieces as a London dramatic company by the summer of 1623. If a remnant of Queen Anne's old troupe did remain together after all these vicissitudes, it must have been a poor thing, and it is lost in the obscurity that hides the companies during and immediately after the plague of 1625.¹

LISTS AND TABLES

In the following tables I have set forth all the known lists of the Queen's men in 1616 and later. Where the names are given in lists whose order might possibly have a significance, I have indicated that order. The 1616 list of signatories to the agreement with the Baskervilles is taken from the bill of the plaintiffs, hence the plaintiffs do not list themselves. The plaintiffs are therefore indicated in the list by P, and the others are given in the order in which they appear in the bill. The 1617 agreement was signed by seven 'fellowes and Sharers' of the company, but four others refused to sign, though they were named in the agreement. The players who refused to sign are indicated by R, the others are given in the order in which they appear.

The lists are taken from the following sources.

1. Fleay, *Stage*, p. 275, and Chambers, *E.S.* II 237, and n.
2. Fleay, *Stage*, pp. 285-6 and 287.
3. *Middx Co Rec* II 170
4. *M S C* II 324-5
5. *Herbert*, p. 63
6. *Murray*, II 193-4
7. Fleay, *Stage*, p. 278.

¹ It has been suggested that the inclusion of Ellis Worth as one of the defendants in the suit following the performance of *The Late Murder in White Chapel, or Keep the Widow Waking* at the Red Bull in September 1624 indicates that some remnant of the old company was still performing in their accustomed theatre. Worth, however, denied that he had ever acted in or seen the play, or that he knew when or how often it had been acted. Now, since it was generally known that the play had been acted at the Red Bull, and since Dekker testified concerning its composition and performance, these categorical denials of Worth could scarcely have gone unchallenged if he had been a regular actor at the Red Bull at the time. The only plausible explanation is that he was no longer connected with the Red Bull at all, but was brought into the original complaint by mistake because he had been one of the chief actors at the theatre for a number of years before 1623.

In his account of the suit concerning this play, Professor Sisson said that he hoped soon to give a full account of the end of the Queen Anne-Revels company from new Record Office documents (*The Library*, VIII [1927], 254), but his account has not yet appeared.

ACTOR LISTS

Actors	¹ Signatories to new agreement with the Baskerville June 1616	² New agreement with Mrs Baskerville 3 June 1617	³ Petitioned City about Red Bull charges 2 Oct 1617	⁴ Allowance for Queen Anne's funeral ~ 13 May 1619 ^a	⁵ Herbert calls players of Keads at Red Bull 1622	⁶ Licensed to take up Children of Keads 8 July 1622	⁷ Called last of old company in suit 23 May 1623
Ellis Worth	P	3	6	9	3	3	^
John Cumber	P	4		10	6	6	x
John Blaney	P	6		12	5	5	x
Chris Beeston	P	1	1	3			
Thomas Heywood	1	2	2	5			
Francis Walpole	2	5					
Robert Reynolds	3	R					
William Robbins	4	7		13	7	7	
Thomas Drewe	5	8	4	16			
Emanuel Reade	6	R					
Richard Perkins	7	R		2	2	2	
Thomas Busse		R	3	11	4	4	
Robert Lee		R		1	1	1	
Robert Pallant				4			
James Holt				6			
Tho Swinerton				7			
Martin Slater				8			
John Edmunds				14			
Greg Sanderson				15			
John Garret				17 ^b			
Rich Harrison			5				
Richard Baxter							

^a Evidently both London and provincial players are included here. Lee, Slater, Edmunds, and Swinerton were primarily provincial actors.

^b Garret does not appear in the list for the funeral allowance in the L.C. books (*M.S.C.* ii 324-5), but only in a list which Collier quotes from a Bridgewater MS (*H.D.P.* i 397). Though there is no apparent motive for forgery I have my doubts about Garret, who never appears elsewhere as a player. It seems to me highly unlikely that he was the court jester. (See Nungesser.)

^c Not in Herbert's list, but *Middx. Co. Rec.* show that he was a player at the Red Bull in April 1622. See 'Flavers'.

PROVINCIAL NOTICES¹

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
5 Nov. 1615-4 Nov. 1616	Southampton	Murray, II 399
1615-16	Barnstaple	Ibid., p. 199
Jan 1615/16	Nottingham	Ibid, p 376
20 Jan 1615/16-17 Feb 1615/16	Dover	Ibid, p 265
17 Feb 1615/16	Coventry	Ibid, p. 247
22 Feb. 1615/16	Leicester	Ibid, p 312
30 Mar 1616	Norwich	Ibid, pp 340-1
11 May-8 June 1616	Dover	Ibid, p. 265
29 May 1616	Norwich	Ibid, p 341
15 Aug 1616	Dunwich	<i>Hist. MSS Com, Records of . . Dunwich</i> , p 93
20 Dec 1616	Dunwich	Ibid, p 94
1616-1617 (probably autumn 1616)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Series X, XII (1909), 42
6 Feb. 1616/17	Leicester	Murray, II. 312
6 Feb 1616/17	Leicester	Ibid.
1616-17	Nottingham	Ibid, p. 376
1616-17	Nottingham	Ibid
1616-17	Southampton	Ibid, p 399
1616-17	Oxford	Boas, p 30
22 Mar. 1616/17-19 Apr. 1617	Dover	Murray, II. 265
31 May 1617	Norwich	Ibid, p. 343
22 Oct 1617	Coventry	Ibid, p 247
1-29 Nov 1617	Dover	Ibid., p 265
3 Dec 1617	Coventry	Ibid, p 248
16 Dec. 1617	Leicester	Ibid., p 312
1617-18	Ipswich	<i>M.S.C.</i> II 283
1617-18	Nottingham	Murray, II 376
10 Mar 1617/18	Gawthorpe Hall, Lancs.	Ibid, p 395
1617-18 (probably spring 1618)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Series X, XII (1909), 42
1618-19	Ludlow	Murray, II. 325
29 Aug 1618	Norwich	Ibid, p. 345
Oct-18 Nov 1618	Dover	Ibid, p. 265
11 Nov. 1618	Reading	<i>Hist. MSS. Com</i> , Report XI, Part VII, p. 210
6 Dec. 1618	Ludlow	Murray, II. 325
1618-19	Winchester	Ibid, p. 406
1619	Leicester	Ibid., p. 313

¹ It should be noted that records of Queen Anne's company in the provinces are especially unreliable as evidence of the presence of the London company. We know that in 1616 there were two separate provincial companies distinct from the London company (see below, p. 178), and it appears that certain Queen's men, like Lee and Swinnerton and Slater, were generally touring with provincial troupes. Several times in the provinces a Queen's company is called 'one other Companye of the Queenes Playors' (Murray, II. 311, 312). I have, however, listed all provincial notices of Queen's companies, even when a provincial company was obviously indicated. In most instances it is impossible to tell whether the company was the London organization or a provincial one. Some eighteen of these provincial notices are not listed by Professor Murray (Murray, I. 202-5).

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
1619	Craven District	Murray, II 255
18 Mar. 1619/20-15 Apr 1620	Dover	Ibid, p 265
29 Mar. 1620	Coventry	Ibid, p 248
1620	Marlborough	Ibid, p 334
23 Dec. 1620	Coventry	Ibid, pp 248-9
c Dec 1620	Nottingham	Ibid, p. 376
1620-1	Marlborough	Ibid, p 334
8 Apr -9 Nov. 1621	Leicester	Ibid, p 314
21 Dec 1621	Leicester	Ibid.
15 Mar 1621/2	Marlborough	Ibid., p. 334
1621-2 (probably spring 1622)	Saffron Walden	N & Q, Series X, XII (1909), 42
12 Apr 1622	Leicester	Murray, II 314
28 June 1622	Norwich	Ibid, p 346
<26 Aug 1622	Leicester	Ibid, p 315
24 May 1623	Norwich	Ibid, p. 347
24 Jan. 1622/3-28 Aug. 1623	Coventry	Ibid., p. 249
27 Jan 1623/4	Leicester	Ibid, p. 315
20 Mar 1623/4	Dover	Ibid, p 266
1623-4	Nottingham	Ibid, p 377
27 Dec 1624	Leicester	Ibid., p. 316
Dec 1624	Coventry	Ibid, p 250
15 Oct 1625	Leicester	Ibid, p 316
16 Oct 1625	Coventry	Ibid, p 250

RED BULL REVELS' PLAYS AT COURT

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt.</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
Christmas 1619-1619/20	<i>The Two Merry Milkmaids</i>	1620 title-page and Nichols, <i>Progresses of James I</i> , IV. 1105
30 Dec. 1621	<i>Gramercy Wit</i>	£10	2 Mar. 1621/2 ^a	Murray, II. 192-3

^a Ellis Worth mentioned.

PLAYS PRESENTED BY QUEEN ANNE'S COMPANY
AFTER 1615

- DABORNE, ROBERT. *The Poor Man's Comfort* 1st ed 1655, the title-page says, 'As it was divers times Acted at the Cock-pit in Drury lane with great applause' B M MS Egerton 1994 has no clue to performance The play has been frequently dated c 1617 and assigned to Queen Anne's company because of one stage direction in the quarto, 'Enter 2 Lords, Sands, Ellis'. If the two actors were Gregory Sanderson and Ellis Worth, the play was probably produced by Queen Anne's at the Cockpit The stage directions may, however, date from a revival of 1635 (see W J Lawrence, *MLR*. xxv. 209), in which case other actors and another company are indicated The assignment of the play to Queen Anne's men c 1617 is only the least dubious of several hypotheses.
- HEYWOOD, THOMAS. *The Rape of Lucrece* 1st ed 1608, the title-page of the 1630 edition says, 'Acted by Her Maiesties Seruants at the Red Bull', but the same information is found in both the preceding editions (1608 and 1609) and the later one (1638) It was the property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (See below, pp 329-30, and Queen Henrietta's, p 253)
- *A Woman Killed with Kindness* 1st ed. 1607; the title-page of the second edition, 1617, says, 'As it hath beene oftentimes Acted by the Queenes Maiest Seruants'.
- MARLOWE, CHRISTOPHER. *Edward II.* 1st ed 1594, the title-page of the 1622 edition says, 'As it was publicly Acted by the late Queenes Maiesties Servants at the Red Bull in S. Iohns streete'.
- WEBSTER, JOHN. *The Devil's Law Case.* 1st ed 1623; the title-page says, 'As it was approouedly well Acted by her Maiesties Seruants'
- ANONYMOUS. *The Honest Lawyer* 1st ed 1616, the title-page says, 'Acted By The Queenes Maiesties Servants. Written by S. S.'
- *Swetnam the Woman Hater* 1st ed 1620; the title-page says, 'Acted at the Red Bull, by the late Queenes Seruants'.

PLAYS PRESENTED BY RED BULL REVELS

- MARKHAM and SAMPSON. *Herod and Antipater.* 1st ed 1622; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene, of late, diuers times publicly Acted (with great Applause) at the Red Bull, by the Company of his Maiesties Revels'.
- MASSINGER and DEKKER. *The Virgin Martyr.* 1st ed. 1622; the title-page says, 'As it hath bin diuers times publicly Acted with great Applause, By the seruants of his Maiesties Reuels'. Licensed 6 October 1620 (*Herbert*, p. 29, n. 2) and relicensed

7 July 1624, 'For the adding of a scene to *The Virgin Martyr*'
(Ibid, p 29)

MAY, THOMAS *The Heir* 1st ed 1622; the title-page says, 'As it was lately Acted by the Company of the Reuels' The 1633 title-page says, 'As it was Acted by the Company of the Revels 1620'

ANONYMOUS. *The Costly Whore* 1st ed. 1633, the title-page says, 'A Comicall Historie, Acted by the Companie of the Revels' This play is usually assigned to the King's Revels company of 1629-36 rather than to the Red Bull Revels company of 1619-23, but I can find no weight in Fleay's arguments (*BCE D* II 339) for a late date. The play seems much too crude and primitive for the time of Charles I, and is quite unlike other plays of the King's Revels company in this respect, though not very different from one or two in the Red Bull Revels company. The fact that both *The Heir*, an undoubted Red Bull Revels play, and *The Costly Whore* were printed by Augustine Matthews in 1633 is a slight suggestion that both had belonged to the same Company.

— *Gramercy Wit* Not extant 'A warrant . . . for one play acted by Ellisworth and his fellowes late servants to Qucene Anne and now the Companie of the Revells the play called gramarcie witt on of 30th of December 1621 . . .' (Murray, II. 192-3, from MS 515, Inner Temple Library)

— *The Two Merry Milkmaids*. 1st ed. 1620, by 'I C', the title-page says, 'As it was Acted before the King, with generall Approbation, by the Companie of the Reuels'.

— *The Two Noble Ladies*. B.M. Egerton MS 1994 is entitled 'A Trage-comicall Historie often tymes acted wth approbation At the Red Bull in St: Iohns Streete By the Company of ye Reuells' (Greg, *Dram Doc*, p 274.)

— *The Welsh Traveller*. Not extant? Licensed 10 May 1622: 'A new Play, called, *The Welsh Traveller*, was allowed to be acted by the players of the Revels' Professor Adams thinks the play might possibly be the same as *The Welsh Ambassador* (*Herbert*, p. 23 and n. 2), a MS. which is now in the Cardiff Public Library. Since Adams wrote, the play has been printed. The title *The Welsh Traveller* would not fit the Cardiff play at all.

CHAPTER IV

LADY ELIZABETH'S (QUEEN OF BOHEMIA'S) COMPANY

Apparently this company came into existence under the patent of 27 April 1611, which authorized John Townsend and Joseph Moore with the rest of their company to play as the Lady Elizabeth's servants. They are found on tour in 1610-11, and the names of Moore and Townsend identify them as the company which gave duplicate bonds of £500 to Henslowe on 29 August 1611 for the observance of certain unknown articles. The signatories to one bond are John Townsend, Joseph Taylor, William Ecclestone, Thomas Hunt, John Rice, Robert Hamlen, Joseph Moore, William Carpenter, Thomas Basse, Alexander Foster, and Francis Waymus. The other bond omits Waymus and adds Giles Gary and William Barksted.

The company played at court in January, February, and March 1611/12, in 1611-12 they were at Dover, Coventry, and Leicester, but they were back to play at court 20 October 1612 and again 25 February and 1 March 1612/13. It appears that in March of this year Henslowe united Rossiter's Queen's Revels with the Lady Elizabeth's company. It was for this combination that Daborne was writing the plays mentioned in his correspondence with Henslowe April 1613-July 1614, a company which Henslowe controlled by keeping them in his debt through questionable means. There was a new agreement between the company and Henslowe and Meade in March 1613/14 in which Nathan Field appears as the leader of the players.

The playhouses at which the company performed in these years are conjectural, though it appears that they included the Swan, the Rose, and Whitefriars. By the autumn of 1614 they were established at the Hope. An enumeration of the company's grievances against Henslowe was drawn up in 1615; it adds materially to our knowledge of the organization and its affairs. In the spring of 1615, after their disagreement with Henslowe, the company came to some sort of an agreement with Prince Charles's men (Fleay and Greg think this amalgamation occurred a year earlier.) This co-operation is shown by the appearance of Rowley and Newton, two Prince's men, to represent, apparently, both companies before the Privy Council in March 1615; by the payment of a Lady Elizabeth's man Alexander Foster, for four plays given by the Prince's company at court, by Rossiter's patent in June 1615 to build a theatre in Blackfriars for both companies and the Queen's Revels; and by the title-page of Field's *Amends for Ladies*, which says that the play was acted by both companies. The repeated use of both company names indicates that the agreement entailed some sort of co-operation, rather than an amalgamation. Whatever this agreement was, it was terminated by Henslowe's death in January 1615/16.

During these years of co-operation in London a Lady Elizabeth's company was appearing alone in the provinces. In 1614 and 1615 they were under the direction of Nicholas Long, but in 1616 John Townsend was their leader.

EDWARD ALLEYN, Henslowe's son-in-law, succeeded to the old broker's theatrical interests on the Bankside, and under his control a permanent amalgamation known as Prince Charles's company replaced the old association of companies which had played for Henslowe.¹ The articles of agreement of 20 March 1615/16 indicating the formation of this company are signed by four former Lady Elizabeth's men—Joseph Taylor, Robert Hamlen, William Barksted, and Robert Pallant.² The loss of these players must have seriously crippled the company, but there is evidence that about the same time they had other losses which were even more serious. Nathan Field, probably the most popular actor in the company,³ had become a King's man by the time *The Queen of Corinth* was presented, and Professor Baldwin contends that he succeeded to the place of William Shakespeare.⁴ This succession seems likely; it would have drawn Field away from the Lady Elizabeth's shortly after the reorganization of the Prince's company. Robert Benfield, another prominent actor, had joined the King's men before *The Mad Lover* was acted, probably some time in 1615.⁵ Both Emanuel Reade and Thomas Basse became members of Queen Anne's company, the former before June 1616 and the latter before June 1617.⁶ Surely no company could stand the loss of eight of its leading members, at least three of whom (Field, Taylor, and Benfield) were already, or soon became, exceedingly well known to London audiences.

There is little doubt that these serious losses reduced the company to a provincial status; it does not appear in London from the time of the agreement of 20 March 1615/16 until

¹ See Prince Charles's company, pp. 198 ff.

² See below, p. 199, n. 2. Taylor, Hamlen, and Barksted were among the members of the company who signed the duplicate bonds to Henslowe in August 1611 (*Hens Paps.*, pp. 18 and 111). Pallant appeared as a member of the company in the grievances against Henslowe (*ibid.*, pp. 86–90).

³ Field represented the company in the agreement with Henslowe and Meade, March 1613/14 (*Hens Paps.*, pp. 23–5), he is mentioned in the list of the company's grievances against Henslowe, and he is named first in each of the company's casts in the 1679 Beaumont and Fletcher folio.

⁴ Baldwin, *Organization*, p. 51.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51 and n. 30. Benfield is known as a Lady Elizabeth's man from the Daborne correspondence (*Hens Paps.*, p. 126) and from his presence in the two Lady Elizabeth's casts in the 1679 folio.

⁶ See 'Players'. Basse signed the duplicate bonds to Henslowe in 1611; Reade is in both Lady Elizabeth's casts in the 1679 folio of Beaumont and Fletcher's works.

1622, when Sir Henry Herbert records that it was performing at the Phoenix in Drury Lane.

Further evidence of the Lady Elizabeth's reduction to a provincial company is to be found in the following order which the Lord Chamberlain sent out in July 1616 by Joseph Moore, one of the leaders of the company, and which was copied into the Norwich records 4 June 1617:

Whereas Thomas Swynnerton and Martin Slaughter beinge two of the Queens Ma^{ts} company of Playors hauinge sepatated themselves from their said Company, have each of them taken forth a severall exemplification or duplicate of his ma^{ts} Letters patente graunted to the whole Company and by vertue thereof they severally in two Companies wth vagabonds and such like idle psons, haue and doe vse and exercise the quallitie of playinge in diuse places of this Realme to the great abuse and wronge of his Ma^{ts} Sub^{ts} in generall and contrary to the true intent and meaninge of his Ma^{ties} to the said Company And whereas William Perrie hauinge likewise gotten a warrant whereby he and a certaine Company of idle psons wth him doe travel and play under the name and title of the Children of his Ma^{ts} Revels, to the great abuse of his Ma^{ts} srvice And whereas also Gilberte Reason one of the prince his highnes Playo^{rs} hauing likewise sepatated himselfe from his Company hath also taken forth another exemplification or duplicate of the patent granted to that Company and lues in the same kinde & abuse And likewise one Charles Marshall, Homfry Jeffes and Willm Parr three of Prince Palatynes Company of Playo^{rs} haveinge also taken forthe an exemplification or duplicate of the patent graunted to the said Company and by vertue thereof liue after the like kinde and abuse Wherefore to the and such idle psons may not be suffered to continewe in this course of life These are therefore to pray, and neatheless in his Ma^{ts} name to will and require you vpon notice giuen of aine of the said psons by the bearer herof Joseph More whome I haue speciallye directed for that purpose that you call the said pties offendo^{rs} before you and therevpon take the said seu[er]all exemplifications or duplicats or other ther warrants by w^{ch} they vse ther saide quallitie from them, And forthwth to send the same to me And also that you take goode and sufficient bonds of any of them to appeare before me at Whitehall at a fixt daye to answere ther said contempte and abuses whereof I desire you not to fayle And these shalbe yo^r sufficient warrant in that behalfe Dated at the Courte at Therbalds this 16th day of July in the fowertenth yeare of the raigne of o^r sou[er]aigne Lord the Kings Ma^{ties} of England ffrance and Irelande and of Scotland the nine and fortieth 1616.

The order is signed 'Pembrook' and addressed 'To all Justices of peace Maio^r Sheriffs Baliffs Constables and other his Ma^ts officers to whome it may apptayne'.¹

The fact that the Lord Chamberlain condemns all duplicates and exemplifications but omits mention of the Lady Elizabeth's men, though the bearer of his order was Joseph Moore, one of the leaders of that company, seems to indicate that there was only one Lady Elizabeth's company at the time. That company *was* travelling, because it appeared at Norwich on 7 June 1617, just three days after Moore had appeared there with this order, which was copied into the Mayor's Court Books.² Moreover, the Mayor of Norwich did not consider that the order applied to this Lady Elizabeth's company, for he gave them permission to play on the three days he had just taken away from Lee's company in obedience to the Lord Chamberlain's order. The fact that Moore appeared with his condemnation of other travelling companies just three days before his own company arrived at Norwich seems too fortunate to be a coincidence. The facts strongly suggest that the Lord Chamberlain's order was issued to clear the field for the benefit of the Lady Elizabeth's company when it was found that the troupe would be forced into a provincial existence.

At any rate, it is apparent that only one Lady Elizabeth's company was in existence at this time.³ It does not appear in London, but it does appear in the provinces: at Norwich 5 June 1616,⁴ 7 June 1617,⁵ 23 May 1618,⁶ 8 February 1618/19 or 1619/20,⁷ 22 April 1620,⁸ 2 May 1621,⁹ and 1 May 1622;⁹ at Bristol in the first quarter, 1620-1;¹⁰ at Coventry in 1616¹¹ and 12 December 1617,¹² 4 January 1618/19,¹² and

¹ Murray, II, 343-4.

² Professor Murray (*ibid.* I, 251-2) notes that the bearer of this order was a leader of the Lady Elizabeth's and that no mention of her company is made therein. He then argues that the provincial Lady Elizabeth's company had been disbanded and proceeds to speculate about the activities of Lady Elizabeth's company in London. His confusion is all the more surprising since he notes the visit of Lady Elizabeth's and their permission to play at Norwich three days after Moore showed his order there. The Lady Elizabeth's are even given the days taken away from Lee and his company 'accordinge to the Lo Chamberlyns warrant before menconed'

³ This continued to be the case. See the licence of 20 March 1617/18 below, p. 181.

⁴ Murray, II, 341.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 344-5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 345 and n.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 346.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 218.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

5 January 1620/1,¹ at Dover 16 May–13 June 1618,² at Exeter 13 December 1617,³ at Leicester 22 February 1617/18,⁴ 20 February 1620/1,⁵ 8 April 1621,⁶ and 15 March 1621/2;⁶ at Marlborough 25 November 1618,⁷ 31 October 1619,⁷ in 1620–21,⁸ and >15 August 1622,⁸ at Nottingham in 1616–17 and in April 1621,⁹ at Plymouth 1618–19,¹⁰ and at Winchester in 1618–19.¹¹

It has frequently been said that the Lady Elizabeth's men accompanied King James on his progress to Scotland, 15 March 1616/17 to 16 May 1617.¹² The evidence presented for this surprising distinction for the company is the following payment:

To John Townsend and Joseph Moore Stage Players upon the Councells warraunte dated at Whitehall 11 July 1617 for acting three severall playes before his Ma^{tye} in his Jorney towards Scotland at the ordinary rates formerly allowed xxx¹¹ 13

In spite of the repeated assertions of stage historians that the company accompanied James on his progress to Scotland,¹⁴ it seems to me highly improbable that a provincial troupe like Lady Elizabeth's men would have been selected for such an honour. There were at least three more distinguished companies acting in London at the time. If the Lady Elizabeth's men—or any other company, for that matter—*had* been so selected, there would surely have been some record of provision for their accommodation and payment for more than simply three plays—as if it cost no more money to go from London to Edinburgh than from London to Theobalds! It is significant that the warrant upon which the Lady Elizabeth's men's distinction has been based says nothing of their

¹ Murray, II, 249

² Ibid., p. 265.

³ Ibid., p. 272

⁴ Ibid., p. 312.

⁵ Ibid., p. 313.

⁶ Ibid., p. 314.

⁷ Ibid., p. 333.

⁸ Ibid., p. 334.

⁹ Ibid., p. 376.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 385. This entry reads, 'Itm given to the Lady Elizabeths Players being 20 persons w^{ch} had the Kings hand for playing aswell by night as by day . . . mth vi^s'

¹¹ Ibid., p. 406.

¹² Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, III, 257 and 317. Though James arrived in Edinburgh on May 16, he went on almost at once and continued moving about Scotland until his return to Edinburgh about the 1st of June (ibid., p. 333). He did not start the journey home to London until 6 August, and he reached London on the 15th of September 1617 (ibid., pp. 389–90).

¹³ Cunningham, *Revels*, p. xlv. The same facts are recorded in Dasent, *Acts P.C.*, 1616–17, p. 295, except that 'certaine players' are named instead of Moore and Townsend, thus leading Collier (*H.E.D.P.* i. 390) to assume that the company was the King's men

¹⁴ Fleay, *Stage*, p. 309; Collier, *H.E.D.P.* i. 390–1; Maas, *Theatertruppen*, p. 114; Murray, I, 252–3.

accompanying the King, but simply records the usual payment. It has seldom been noted that Moore and Townsend received their payment for these three performances at London two months before the King's return, that Weldon makes no mention of the Lady Elizabeth's men in Scotland,¹ as he probably would have done had they been there, and that the Lady Elizabeth's men were back at Norwich by 7 June 1617.² Obviously the Lady Elizabeth's men could not have *stayed* with the King in Scotland.

The whole notion of the presence of the company in James's train is an unwarranted conclusion based only on the warrant of 11 July 1617. It seems to me much more probable that the Lady Elizabeth's men in their regular circuit encountered the King on his way to Scotland, perhaps by design. They performed three plays before the King and went on with their regular tour, arriving at Norwich just two days earlier than they had arrived the year before and two weeks later than they did the year following.³

On 20 March 1617/18 a new licence was granted to the company. Though no copies of this licence are known, the Norwich clerk extracted the necessary information when he wrote in the Mayor's Court Books under the date of 23 May 1618:

This day John Towneshend brought A Lycence signed by his Matie and vnder his privie Signet dated the xxth day of March 1617 whereby Alexander ffoster John Townsend Joseph Moore & ffr Wamus servants to the Lady Elizabeth are lycensed to play in the City of London & by the space of xiii^{en} dayes at any one tyme in the yeare in any other Citty And by the same yt ys exp^{re}ssely menconed that there shalbe but one Company as servants to the Lady Elizabeth lycensed or pmittid to play.⁴

In spite of the statement of the licence that the company might perform in London, they can be traced only in the provinces for the next four years.

¹ Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, III, 338-43. Maas makes the preposterous statement about the Lady Elizabeth's men that 'sie wurden in Schottland Children of the Chapel genannt' (*Theatertruppen*, p. 114).

² Murray, II, 344.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 341-5. None of the scholars who have subscribed to the myth of the Lady Elizabeth's company's place in the train of James I in his progress to Scotland has realized that the company had only a provincial existence in 1617.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 344-5. Professor Murray (*ibid.* I, 252-3) is badly confused in the chronology of events at the time of the granting of this licence and the King's journey to Scotland. The difficulty is that in changing his dates from old style to new he has neglected to change the date of this licence from 1617 to 1618.

In March 1621/2 we have records of the stages of a new patent for the Lady Elizabeth's men. In the document which Professor Murray found in the Inner Temple Library occurs the following item, dated the 13th of March:

A bill signed for John Townsend Alexander Foster & Joseph Moore the Lady Elizabeths graces her player^s and one Francis Wambus name being added by the Clerke of ye Signett in drawing vp of the bill allthough not menconed in his Lo^p warrant¹

Though Professor Murray has this entry listed under 1622, the date must be 1621/2; it evidently indicates a bill for the licence referred to by the clerk at Norwich, 10 May 1623, in the following extract:

. . . a Patent signed by his^mtie vnder his highnes prvie Signet dated the 20th of March 1621 whereby John Towneshend Alex ffoster Joseph Moore & the said wambus servants to the Lady Eliz wth the rest of their Company authorised to play Comedies &c . . .²

This licence is referred to again in almost identical words at Norwich 24 April 1624.³

In 1621 or 1622 a new metropolitan Lady Elizabeth's company must have been formed, for in the latter year a troupe under her patronage appears at the Phoenix in Drury Lane.⁴ The company at the Phoenix does not appear to be the provincial organization, for of the four actors repeatedly mentioned in provincial records 1616-22 as leaders of that troupe—John Townsend, Joseph Moore, Alexander Foster, Francis Wambus—only Joseph Moore is mentioned by Sir Henry Herbert in the list of the seven chief actors at the Phoenix in 1622. And Moore is the most dubious of the leaders of the provincial troupe, for in 1620 he is said to be no longer travelling with the company,⁵ and in the records of 1621 and 1622 and 1624 his presence is never specifically mentioned, as is that of Townsend and Wambus.⁶ Furthermore, the provincial company under Townsend and Wambus continues to appear in the country in 1622, 1623, and 1624, when there are numerous records of a Lady Elizabeth's company in London.

We are fairly safe in assuming, therefore, that the company performing at the Phoenix in 1622, 1623, and 1624 was a new Lady Elizabeth's company and not simply the old provincial troupe brought to town.

¹ Murray, II 193, from MS. 515, No 7, Inner Temple Library.

² Ibid., pp 346-7.

³ Ibid., p 348.

⁴ See below, pp. 183-4.

⁵ Murray, II. 345.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 345-50

Unfortunately we have no record of the formation of this new London organization. The presence of Christopher Beeston among the leaders makes it reasonable to suppose that he had an active hand in organizing the new company for his theatre.¹ But whether the Lady Elizabeth's company was formed to oust the Prince's men from the Phoenix, or simply succeeded them there, or from what groups the new company was recruited, we do not know.²

The earliest evidence of the new company appears in Sir Henry Herbert's licence to them of *The Changeling*. The record of this licence, which has been recently discovered by Mr. W. J. Lawrence on the flyleaf of Malone's copy of the play,³ reads, 'Licensed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, May 7, 1622.'

Another reference to the new company is found under the date 1622 in the lists of London companies in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book:

The chiefe of them at the Phoenix. Christopher Beeston, Joseph More, Eliard Swanson, Andrew Cane, Curtis Grevill, William Shurlock, Anthony Turner ⁴

The name of Joseph Moore in this list and subsequent entries in Herbert's office-book which note the presence of the Lady Elizabeth's at the Cockpit leave no doubt that Herbert's Phoenix players were Lady Elizabeth's company. But the list is a puzzling one. Of the seven men, only Moore has been known as a Lady Elizabeth's man before. Beeston had belonged to various companies, lately to Prince Charles's, but he seems to have been a member of whatever company was playing at his theatre.⁵ The other five appear here for the first time.⁵ But the most puzzling feature of the list is the presence in it of Cane and Greville, who appear at this same date in Herbert's office-book as Palsgrave's men.⁶

The best suggestion for a resolution of this difficulty is Professor Murray's.⁷ He thinks that at about this time Cane and Greville left the Lady Elizabeth's and joined the

¹ See 'Players'.

² Fleay thought (*Stage*, pp. 272-3) that the new Lady Elizabeth's company was made from the old Queen Anne's, that Beeston and Heywood left the old company for the new between May 1619 and July 1622, and that Worth, Cumber, Blaney, and Robbins joined them between May and July 1623. This is an interesting speculation, but unfortunately there is no evidence that Heywood, Worth, Cumber, Blaney, or Robbins were ever Lady Elizabeth's men at all.

³ See *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923.

⁵ See 'Players'.

⁶ *Herbert*, p. 63.

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 63.

⁷ Murray, i. 215-16.

Palsgrave's men, who in 1622 were building the new Fortune.¹ This theory requires the assumption that Herbert was careless or uncertain in making his lists, but it is the best I know. It receives slight support from Cane's appearance in 1632 as a Prince Charles II's man, but more from the recently discovered bond of six Palsgrave's men to Richard Gunnell dated 30 April 1624 and signed by Andrew Cane.²

The years immediately after the opening of the Lady Elizabeth's company at the Phoenix seem to have been among the most prosperous in the existence of the company. In 1623 Heminges and Condell refer flatteringly to them in their epistle to the First Folio of Shakespeare: 'And though you be a Magistrate of wit, and sit on the Stage at *Black-Friers*, or the *Cock-pit*, to arraigne Playes dailie'.³ The same association of the Cockpit with the fashionable Blackfriars is seen in a letter of James Howell of about this time.

. . . but I misse you extremely, therfore I pray make haste, for *London Streets* which you and I have trod together so often, will prove tedious to me else. Amongst other things, *Black-Fryers* will entertain you with a *Play Spick and span new*, and the *Cock-Pit* with another; nor I beleeeve after so long absence, will it be an unpleasing object for you to see.⁴

Success of a more solid sort is indicated in the contribution of £20 to the erection of a new church building in St. Giles in the Fields by 'the plaiers of the Cockpitt Playehouse's and by the following entries in the assessment book. 'the Phoenix playehouse, viij^l. xiiij^s. v^d. rece^d by Mr. Speckart' and 'Receaved from Mr. Biston, as from y^e Cockpitt, for and towards y^e building of y^e church, y^e sm of tenn pounds & seaven shillings'.⁶

Prosperity is also suggested by Sir Henry Herbert's licensing of thirteen plays for the company in the thirty-three months after they first appear in London in May 1622. Nine of the thirteen are by Middleton, Rowley, Massinger, Ford, Dekker, Heywood, and Shirley—a distinguished list of dramatists. Such plays were probably both a cause and a result of the company's prosperity. Herbert's licences are as follows:

¹ See above, pp 141-4 and p 146, n. 1.

² Hotson, pp 51-4.

³ Noted in Adams, p 355.

⁴ James Howell, *Epistolæ Ho-Ehannæ* (1645), Section 4, Letter II, p 4. Dated 20 January 1624/5 in the 1650 edition.

⁵ Parton, *St. Giles*, p. 197.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 234-5.

7 May 1622—*The Changeling*, 'Licensed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, May 7, 1622'¹

10 May 1622—'A new Play, called, *The Blucke Ladye*, was allowed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants'²

3 June 1622—'A new Play, called, *The Valiant Scholler*, allowed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants'³

9 July 1623—On the flyleaf of Malone's copy of *The Spanish Gipsy* is the following notation 'Acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, July 9, 1623, as appears by the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert.'⁴

21 August 1623—'For the Lady Elizabeth's Servants of the Cockpit; An Old Play, called, *Match me in London*; which had been formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke'⁵

12 September 1623—'For the Lady Elizabeth's Players, a new Comedy, called, *The Cra . . . Marchant, or Come to my Country house*, Written by William Bonen . . .'⁶

3 December 1623—'For the Queen of Bohemia's Company, *The Noble Bondman*: Written by Philip Messenger, gent.'⁷

3 March 1623/4—'For the Cockpit Company; *The Sun's Darling*; in the nature of a masque by Deker, and Forde.'⁸

17 April 1624—'For the Cockpit; *The Renegado, or the Gentleman of Venice*: Written by Messenger'⁹

3 September 1624—'For the Cockpit Company; A new Play, called, *The Captive, or The Lost recovered*: Written by Hayward'¹⁰

¹ W J Lawrence, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923

² *Herbert*, p. 23 Fleay and others have contended that the date for this entry and the one of 3 June following should be 1623, but see above, pp. 167-9, and below, p. 205, n. 5

³ *Herbert*, p. 24

⁴ W J. Lawrence, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923.

⁵ *Herbert*, p. 25 The 1631 title-page says, ' . . . often Presented, First, at the Bull in St. Johns-street, And lately, at the Priuate-House in Drury-Lane, called the Phoenix'. Apparently *Match Me in London* was an old Queen Anne's play which Beeston had managed to retain when that company left his house.

⁶ *Herbert*, p. 25. See below, pp. 206 ff.

⁷ *Herbert*, p. 26. On 14 February 1612/13 the Lady Elizabeth married Frederick V, Elector Palatine On 7 November 1619 she became Queen of Bohemia.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28 The play was printed in 1630 as 'acted by the Queenes Maesties seruants' and with a cast of her actors It might seem at first that the 1630 title-page and similar ones for plays noted below would indicate that the play had been written for Queen Henrietta's company and that her company had therefore already occupied the Cockpit at this date. Certain facts belie this assumption and show that Lady Elizabeth's men remained at the Cockpit until 1625. In the first place, there was no Queen Henrietta until 1625. In the second place, the Lady Elizabeth's men presented *Tu Quoque* at court, 6 January 1624/5 This play had been printed in 1614 as belonging to Queen Anne's company, and apparently Beeston had kept it, as he kept others. Had Lady Elizabeth's men left his house before this date, they would not still have had this play

¹⁰ *Herbert*, p. 29.

14 October 1624—'For the Cockpit Company, A new Play, called, *The City Night Cap* Written by Davenport.'¹

3 November 1624—'For the Cockpit Company, A new Play, called, *The Parliament of Love* Written by Massinger'²

11 February 1624/5—'For the Cockpit Company, A new Play, called, *Love-Tricks with Compliments*'³

Further evidence of the company's return to importance in London is furnished by the records of their renewed performances before the royal family. They gave court performances on 5 November⁴ and 27 December 1623,⁵ and 4 January 1623/4.⁶ The next year they were at Whitehall 28 December 1624⁷ and 6 January 1624/5.⁸

However, the prosperous days of the company were not to last for long, for the terrible plague of 1625 was at hand. During March playing was probably restricted for Lent and then prohibited entirely for the period of mourning following the death of King James on the 27th. By the time of the King's funeral the plague deaths were increasing rapidly for the worst visitation in the history of the city. Each week in August the death toll was around 4,000. The theatres were closed for a period of not less than eight months, from at least the end of March to the end of November.⁹

This long period of idleness for the players brought about great changes in the London theatrical world—changes which were further complicated by the reorganizations incident upon the accession of a new king and the arrival from France of a new queen. In this period the Lady Elizabeth's company was evidently broken up, for it disappears entirely from London and from the provinces, and by October 1626

¹ *Herbert*, p. 29; the play was printed in 1661 as 'Acted by Her Majesties Servants'.

² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 31. Printed in 1631 as *The School of Compliment*, 'Acted by her Majesties Servants'.

⁴ 'Upon the fifth of November att Whitehall, the prince being there only, *The Gipsye*, by the Cockpitt company' (*Ibid.*, p. 51).

⁵ 'Upon St. John's night, the prince only being there, *The Bondman*, by the queene [of Bohemia's] company Att Whitehall' (*Ibid.*) The play was licensed for this company three weeks earlier on 3 December.

⁶ 'Upon the Sondag after, beinge the 4 of January 1623, by the Queene of Bohemias company, *The Changeinge*, the prince only being there Att Whitehall.' (*Ibid.*)

⁷ 'Upon Innocents night, the [prince] and the duke of Brunswyck being there, *Cupids Revenge*, by the Queen of Bohemia's Servants Att Whitehall, 1624' (*Ibid.*, p. 52).

⁸ 'Upon Twelve night, the Masque being putt of, and the prince only there, *Tu Quoque*, by the Queene of Bohemias servants. Att Whitehall, 1624.' (*Ibid.*)

⁹ See Appendix, pp. 654-7.

six of its seven known members had appeared as members of other London companies,¹ and its theatre was occupied by a new organization.²

The evidence for the break-up of the Lady Elizabeth's company during or shortly after the plague of 1625 seems complete. By May 1626, and probably earlier, their theatre, the Phoenix, was being used by the new Queen Henrietta's company. It seems probable that Christopher Beeston, who owned that playhouse, chose the occasion of the long plague closing and the arrival of a new queen in London to form a new troupe under her patronage.³ Beeston certainly appropriated several members of the Lady Elizabeth's company and a number of their plays for the new organization. Beeston, Sherlock, and Turner, all mentioned as Lady Elizabeth's men before 1625, appear as Queen Henrietta's men later—Sherlock and Turner as actors and Beeston as manager.⁴ *The Renegado*, *The Spanish Gypsy*, *The Changeling*, *All's Lost by Lust*, and *The School of Compliment*, all once owned by Lady Elizabeth's men, were later performed by Queen Henrietta's, and presumably other former Lady Elizabeth's plays which were the property of Beeston's Boys at the Phoenix in 1639 had also been the property of Queen Henrietta's men 1625-36. Evidently, then, Beeston drew on both the personnel and the repertory of the Lady Elizabeth's company to form Queen Henrietta's men.

Thus of the seven men named by Sir Henry Herbert as the chief members of Lady Elizabeth's company in 1622, three had left their old organization to become Queen Henrietta's men before May 1626. Of the other four, Andrew Cane was a Palsgrave's man by 30 April 1624, Eyllaerdt Swanston was a King's man by 20 December 1624; and Curtis Greville was a King's man by October 1626. Joseph Moore is the only one of the seven who cannot be shown to have deserted the company.⁵

Finally, the evidence for the disintegration of the Lady Elizabeth's company is made complete by the fact that there is not a single reference to the organization in London from the record of their court performance of 6 January 1624/5 to

¹ See below.

² See below, pp. 218 ff.

³ See below, pp. 218-19.

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁵ See 'Players'. 'Gib' and 'Taylor', whose names are found in the MS of Heywood's *Captives* and who were probably hired men of the company, cannot be traced.

the warrant to swear ten members of the new company as Grooms of the Chamber 30 June 1628. And though there are fairly numerous records of provincial visits of the Lady Elizabeth's players in 1621, 1622, 1623, and 1624, there is not a single one between July 1624 and 1629.

It has usually been assumed either that the Lady Elizabeth's company was made over by Beeston into the Queen Henrietta's at the Phoenix, or that the Lady Elizabeth's men continued to act as a company in London, though their theatre is not known.¹ We have noted that the second of these alternatives is almost certainly wrong. The first is equally improbable, for more Queen Henrietta's men can be traced to other companies than to the Lady Elizabeth's.² Certain evidence which has recently come to light indicates a quite different Caroline career for the remainder of Lady Elizabeth's company. This new evidence shows that although at least three Lady Elizabeth's men went over to the new Queen Henrietta's company, others must have united with the remnant of the Palsgrave's company, which had also gone to pieces during or immediately after the plague of 1625,³ to form a new and hitherto unrecorded London troupe called the King and Queen of Bohemia's company. Such a company certainly did exist, and though very little is known of its make-up, it seems highly probable from the names of its patrons and from the status of the two former companies of the unfortunate royal pair that the new organization was an amalgamation of the two crippled Jacobean companies. This company is discussed below, pp. 260-9; it was in existence by September 1626 and still active in December 1630.

Though the Jacobean Lady Elizabeth's company came to an end in 1625 or 1626, another one was formed, apparently for London activities, in 1628. In the Lord Chamberlain's warrant books under the date of 30 June 1628 appears

A Warraunt to sweare the Queene of Bohemia's Players Groomes of his Ma^{tes} Chamber in ordinary without fee. vizt) Ioseph Moore, Alexander Foster Robert Gylman, Richard Broome,⁴ Iohn Lillie,

¹ Murray, i. 259.

² See below, pp. 219-20.

³ See above, pp. 151-3.

⁴ The appearance of Richard Broome in this list is a faint suggestion that this company played at the Red Bull during the next few years, for when Richard Broome signed his contract to write plays for the Salisbury Court in 1635 he had just come, Professor Wallace said, from the Red Bull. (See Andrews, *Broome*, pp. 13-15.)

[Richard Wicks] Wm Rogers, George Lillie, Abell Swinarton, George Giles [Iohn Iewell] Oliuer Iones¹

On 17 July 1628 in the same book there occurs a warrant for the preparation of a King's bill for 'ye Queene of Bohemia's Players':

Joseph Moore, Robert Gilman, Alexander Foster and [blank] and the rest of their Company the Lady Elizabeths [Company] ser-vantes . . . with the same Priviledges as Iohn Townsend, Alexander Foster Ioseph Moore and Francis Wambus and their company haue heeretofore enjoyed in the time of or Souueraigne Lord King James²

A later stage of this licence is recorded in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, on 9 December 1628; it names Moore, Foster, Guilman, and Townsend.³

The wording of the warrant for the King's bill strongly suggests the revival of a company which had lapsed since the days of King James. Of the men to be sworn Grooms of the Chamber, all appear here for the first time, except Moore and Foster, who had had long careers, chiefly provincial, as Lady Elizabeth's men.⁴

This company was evidently formed for London activities, as the players were sworn Grooms of the Chamber.⁵ There is further evidence that a new company was being assembled

¹ See *M S C* ii 347. This document was printed by Mrs Stopes in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910, but inaccurately.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 347-8.

³ Licence to Joseph Moore, Alexander Foster, Robert Guilman, and Joseph Tounsend, with the rest of their company, servants to the Lady Elizabeth, his Majesty's sister, to practise the playing of comedies, histories, tragedies, and interludes, in and about the city of London, or any other place they shall think fitting. [*Docquet*] (C S P Dom., 1628-9, p. 406.) That 'Joseph' Townsend is a copyist's mistake for John Townsend is shown by the record of this document at Reading where he is called John as usual. The Reading note also shows that the licence reached its final stage on 15 December 1628 (Murray, ii. 386).

⁴ See 'Players'. Moore, it will be remembered, is the only man in the Lady Elizabeth's list of 1622 who had not appeared in some other company by 1626. This fact and his appearance as the first man in both the above lists seem to indicate his leadership in the new organization.

⁵ The warrant says that the company was licensed 'to vse and exercise the qualty of playing Comedyes Historyes, Interludes and other Stage Playes in and about the City of London and else where in any City University, Borough, Towne or Place wthin his Ma^{ties} Domynions. . . .' The special authority for playing in London is, however, less significant than the fact that the players were made Grooms, for it will be remembered that the provincial company of 1616-22 had a licence of 20 March 1617/18 which authorized them to play in London, though there is no evidence that they ever did so. (See above, p. 181.)

when 'Iohn Bugge one of the Queene of Bohemia's Players'¹ was sworn a Groom of the Chamber 10 January 1628/9 and Thomas Seabrooke, John Daunce, and Thomas Barnes were sworn 2 July 1629 as the 'Queene of Bohemia's Players'.²

One gets the impression that there was something odd about this company. Most of the actors are previously unheard of. There was certainly a fraud about the dramatic activities of Thomas Barnes, probably about those of John Bugge, and possibly about those of other members of the company. Thomas Barnes was not a player at all, but used his livery to cover dishonest dealings, and was ordered discharged from His Majesty's service 23 January 1631/2.³ Moreover, the Lord Chamberlain says that Joseph Moore, the leader of the company, had assisted in the perpetration of this fraud for his own gain.³ About a year before Barnes's discharge the College of Physicians had petitioned the Lord Chamberlain against John Bugge, another of the Queen of Bohemia's players, for practising physic against the charter of the College.⁴ The men of this company are complained against with suspicious frequency. In the Lord Chamberlain's books for 1628-32 (the years of the known London existence of this company) I have found some twenty-eight petitions to the Lord Chamberlain for permission to bring suit against men recognizable as actors.⁵ Of these twenty-eight petitions, certainly twelve and perhaps fifteen are directed against various members of this Queen of Bohemia's company. All this evidence suggests that the Lady Elizabeth's company of 1628 was a curious troupe, but I can throw no further light on its status. There is not even any evidence as to what London theatre it used, though the Red Bull would be the most likely guess.

I have been able to find no records of the activities of the Lady Elizabeth's or Queen of Bohemia's company after 1632, but apparently they did continue to exist as late as 1641. Among the Lord Chamberlain's records there is one book (L.C. 3/1), 'an Establishment list of Servants of the Chamber

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 348.

² *Ibid.*, p. 350. Mrs. Stopes printed a summary of these items in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910. She has misread Daunce as Danner.

³ See 'Players', and *M.S.C.* ii. 356-7, 405-7.

⁴ See 'Players', and *M.S.C.* ii. 403-4.

⁵ Most of these petitions are printed *M.S.C.* ii. 402 ff., but I have found eight others which escaped Miss Boswell's notice.

in 1641', which contains the following notation at the foot of a list of Grooms of the Chamber Extraordinary

Note that y^e Companies of Players vnder the Titles of the kings, Queens, Qu^e of Bohemia, Prince & Duke of Yorke are all of them sworne Groomes of the Chamber in ord' wthout flee ¹

It is curious that this company left no traces of its existence in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, or on the title-pages of plays, or even in the provincial records after 1632. One is almost inclined to question the accuracy of the Lord Chamberlain's note.

Obviously our knowledge of the Queen of Bohemia's players after they left the Cockpit in 1625 is very scanty. What facts there are must wait for the discovery of others to give them meaning.²

LISTS AND TABLES

The lists and tables which follow have been prepared on the same principles as those which accompany the King's, Queen's, and Palsgrave's. The sources for the various lists of players of the Lady Elizabeth's company, p. 192, are as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 Murray, ii 251-386. | 6 <i>M.S.C.</i> ii 347 |
| 2. <i>Ibid</i> , pp 344-5 | 7. <i>C.S.P.</i> , <i>Dom.</i> , 1628-9, p 406, |
| 3 Cunningham, <i>Revels</i> , p xlv. | and Murray, ii. 386 |
| 4. Murray, ii 346-7. | 8 <i>M.S.C.</i> ii 348 and 350. |
| 5 <i>Herbert</i> , p 63 | |

¹ *M.S.C.* ii 327.

² However slight our information about this new Lady Elizabeth's company may be, there are enough facts to disprove Fleay's statement about the licence of 1628. 'Merely a strolling company, who are afterwards unheard of' (*Fleay, Stage*, p 332.)

ACTOR LISTS

<i>Actors</i>	1 Usually named leaders of provincial company 1616-22	2 New licence 20 March 1616/17	3 Paid for 3 plays at court 11 July 1617	4 New licence 20 March 1620/1	5 Herbert calls Chief at Phoenix 1622	6 Warrant to swear Grooms as Q of B players 30 June 1628	7 Mentioned as leaders of new company 9 Dec and 24 Dec 1629	8 Sworn Grooms as Lady E's players 10 Jan and 12 July 1629
John Townsend	1	2	1	1	.	.	4	.
Joseph Moore	2	3	2	3	2	1	1	..
Alexander Foster	.	1	..	2	.	2	2	..
Francis Wambus	..	4	..	4
Christopher Beeston	1
Eyllaerdt Swanston	3
Andrew Cane	4
Curtis Greville	5
William Sherlock	6
Anthony Turner	7	.	.	.
Robert Gilman	3	3	..
Richard Brome	4	.	..
John Lillie	5	.	.
William Rogers	6	..	.
George Lillie	7	..	.
Abell Swinarton	8	..	.
George Giles	9	.	.
Oliver Jones	10	.	.
Richard Weeks	del.	.	.
John Jewell	del.	.	.
John Bugge	1
Thomas Seabrook	2
John Daunce	3
Thomas Barnes	4

PROVINCIAL NOTICES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
5 June 1616	Norwich	Murray, II 341
1 July 1616	Leicester	Ibid., p 312
c July 1616	Coventry	Ibid., p 247
7 June 1617	Norwich	Ibid., p 344
1616-17	Nottingham	Ibid., p 376
12 Dec 1617	Coventry	Ibid., p 248
13 Dec 1617	Exeter ¹	Ibid., p 272
22 Feb. 1617/18	Leicester	Ibid., p 312
23 May 1618	Norwich	Ibid., pp 344-5
16 May-13 June 1618	Dover	Ibid., p. 265
25 Nov 1618	Marlborough	Ibid., p 333
1618-19	Winchester	Ibid., p 406
1618-19	Plymouth	Ibid., p 385
1618-19	Ipswich ²	<i>M S C</i> II 283
4 Jan 1618/19	Coventry	Murray, II 248
31 Oct 1619	Marlborough	Ibid., p 333
8 Feb 1619/20	Norwich	Ibid., p 345
22 Apr 1620	Norwich	Ibid.
29 Sept-25 Dec 1620	Bristol	Ibid., p 218
5 Jan 1620/1	Coventry	Ibid., p 249
20 Feb 1620/1	Leicester	Ibid., p 313
8 Apr. 1621	Leicester	Ibid.
April 1621	Nottingham	Ibid., p 376
2 May 1621	Norwich	Ibid., p 346
1620-1	Marlborough	Ibid., p 334
15 Mar 1621/2	Leicester	Ibid., p 314
1 May 1622	Norwich	Ibid., p 346
> 15 Aug 1622	Marlborough	Ibid., p. 334
1622-3	Barnstaple	Ibid., p 199
24 Jan 1622/3	Coventry	Ibid., p. 249
25 Jan 1622/3	Leicester	Ibid., p. 315
10 May 1623	Norwich	Ibid., pp. 346-7
13 Oct 1623	Leicester	Ibid., p. 315
20 Mar 1623/4-17 Apr. 1624	Dover	Ibid., p. 266
1624	Lyme Regis	Ibid., p. 327
24 Apr 1624	Norwich	Ibid., p. 348
July 1624	Coventry	Ibid., p. 250
9 July 1624	Leicester	Ibid., p. 316
1623-4	Nottingham	Ibid., p. 377
1629	Leicester	Ibid., p. 317
27 June 1629	Norwich	Ibid., p 353
24 Dec. 1629	Reading	Ibid., p 386
3 Mar 1629/30	Norwich	Ibid., p 353
June 1630	Coventry	Ibid., p 251
1630	Leicester	Ibid., p 318
30 Mar 1631	Coventry	Ibid., p. 251
18 June 1631	Doncaster	Ibid., p 257
13 Aug. 1631	Reading	Ibid., p. 387

¹ Professor Murray thinks this must be a mistaken date (Murray, I. 263, n 1).

² The entry reads, 'To the Ladye Elizabeth's plaiers & the princes plaiers', but since the reward paid was double the usual amount, it is not likely that we have a combined company noticed here, but rather two separate payments entered together.

PLAYS GIVEN AT COURT BY THE
LADY ELIZABETH'S MEN

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
15 Mar 1616/17 -16 May 1617 ^a 5 Nov 1623	3 <i>The [Spanish] Gypsy</i>	£30 ..	11 July 1617 ^b	Cunningham, <i>Revels</i> , p. xlv <i>Herbert</i> , p. 51
27 Dec 1623	<i>The Bondman</i>	.	..	Ibid
4 Jan 1623/4	<i>The Changeling</i>	.		Ibid
28 Dec. 1624	<i>Cupid's Revenge</i>	..		Ibid, p. 52
6 Jan 1624/5	<i>Tu Quoque</i>	.		Ibid.

^a Plays given on James's journey to Scotland by the provincial company

^b Moore and Townsend were paid.

REPERTORY OF LADY ELIZABETH'S COMPANY
AFTER 1615

BEAUMONT and FLETCHER *Cupid's Revenge*. 1st ed. 1615 and 2nd ed. 1630 say it was acted by the Children of the Revels, but it was presented at court 28 December 1624 'by the Queen of Bohemia's Servants' (*Herbert*, p. 52). Presented at court 7 February 1636/7 by Beeston's Boys (*ibid*, p. 57) and protected for them by the Lord Chamberlain 10 August 1639. (See *M S C* ii. 389-90.)

BONEN, WILLIAM *The Cra . . Merchant, or Come to My Country House*. Not extant. Licensed 12 September 1623 'For the Lady Elizabeth's Players, a new Comedy, called, *The Cra . . Marchant, or Come to my Country house*, Written by William Bonen. It was acted at the Red Bull, and licensed without my hand to it, because they were none of the four Companys.' (*Herbert*, p. 25.)¹ In the S. R. 9 September 1653 is entered 'The Crafty Merchant, or the Souldred Citizen'. Two plays, not one, are entered here (See *Soddered Citizen*, pp. v-vi)

COOKE, JOHN. *Greene's Tu Quoque*. 1st ed. 1614, the title-page says, 'As it hath beene diuers times acted by the Queenes Maesties Seruants'. It was presented at court 6 January 1624/5 'by the Queene of Bohemias servants'. (*Herbert*, p. 52.)

DAVENPORT, ROBERT *The City Night-cap*. 1st ed 1661, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with great Applause, by Her Majesties Servants, at the Phoenix in Drury Lane', but it was licensed 14 October 1624 'For the Cockpit Company' (*Herbert*, p. 29), and Lady Elizabeth's company occupied the Cockpit at this time. Protected for Beeston's Boys by the Lord Chamberlain 10 August 1639. (*M S C*. ii. 389-90.)

¹ Professor Adams says, with reason, that the last sentence cannot belong to this item, because the Lady Elizabeth's company was certainly one of the four companies and was almost certainly at the Phoenix at this time (see above, p. 182).

DEKKER, THOMAS *Match Me in London*. 1st ed. 1631, the title-page says, 'As it hath beene often Presented; First, at the Bull in St Iohns-street, And lately, at the Priuate-House in Drury-Lane, called the Phoenix'. Licensed 21 August 1623: 'For the Lady Elizabeth's Servants of the Cockpit, An Old Play, called, *Match me in London*, which had been formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke.' (*Herbert*, p. 25.)

DEKKER and FORD *The Sun's Darling* 1st ed 1656, the title-page says, 'As it hath been often presented at *Whitehall*, by their Majesties Servants, and after at the Cock-pit in *Drury Lane*, with great Applause', and it was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (*M S C.* ii. 389-90), but it was licensed 3 March 1623/4 'For the Cockpit Company' (*Herbert*, p. 27), and Lady Elizabeth's company was at the Cockpit at this time. (See above, p. 182.)

HEYWOOD, THOMAS *The Captives* B.M. Egerton MS 1994; printed in Bullen's *Old English Plays*, 1885 Licensed 3 September 1624 'For the Cockpit Company,' A new Play, called, *The Captive, or The Lost recovered* Written by Hayward.' (*Herbert*, p. 29.)

MARSTON, JOHN *The Dutch Courtesan*. 1st ed. 1605; the title-page says, 'As it was played in the Blacke-Friars by the Children of her Maiesties Reuels' But the Lady Elizabeth's men presented it at court 25 February 1612/13 and 12 December 1613 (Chambers, *E S.* iv. 180 and 182) 'the Dutch Curtizan' has been cancelled in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance (see Marcham, *Revels*, p. 15, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 483 and 484). If this suggestion is correct, the play was probably still in the repertory of Lady Elizabeth's men

MASSINGER, PHILIP. *The Bond Man*. 1st ed. 1624, the title-page says, 'As it hath been often Acted with good allowance, at the Cock-pit in Drury-lane: by the most Excellent Princesse, the Lady Elizabeth her Seruants'. Licensed 3 December 1623 'For the Queen of Bohemia's Company; *The Noble Bondman*. Written by Philip Messenger, gent.' and presented by them at court 27 December 1623 (*Herbert*, pp. 26 and 51). Protected for Beeston's Boys by the Lord Chamberlain 10 August 1639. (*M S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *The Parliament of Love*. Last four acts preserved in Dyce MS. 39, Library of South Kensington Museum First printed 1805 in Gifford's edition of Massinger. Licensed 3 November 1624: 'For the Cockpit Company;' A new Play, called,

¹ See above, p. 182, for the establishment of the Lady Elizabeth's company at the Cockpit at this time.

Massinger, Philip (*cont*)

The Parliament of Love: Written by Massinger.' (*Herbert*, p. 30)

- *The Renegado* 1st ed 1630, the title-page says, 'As it hath bene often acted by the Queenes Maiesties seruants, at the priuate Play-house in *Drurye-Lane*' But it was licensed before the organization of Queen Henrietta's men, while Lady Elizabeth's men were still at the Phoenix, on 17 April 1624: 'For the Cockpit;' *The Renegado, or the Gentleman of Venice* Written by Messenger' (*Herbert*, p. 28) Evidently the play remained with the theatre, for it was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

MIDDLETON and ROWLEY *The Changeling* 1st ed 1653, the title-page says that it was acted 'at the Privat house in Drury-Lane, and Salisbury Court' 'Licensed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, May 7, 1622' (W. J. Lawrence, quoting Malone, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923, p. 820). Presented at court 4 January 1623/4 'by the Queene of Bohemias company' (*Herbert*, p. 51) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

- *The Spanish Gypsy* 1st ed. 1653, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted (with great Applause) at the Privat House in Drury-Lane, and Salisbury Court'. 'Acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, July 9, 1623, as appears by the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert, then Master of the Revels'; Mr Lawrence says this date is that of the licence, not the acting date (W. J. Lawrence, quoting Malone, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923, p. 820) Presented at court 5 November 1623 'The Gipsye, by the Cockpitt company.' (*Herbert*, p. 51)

ROWLEY, WILLIAM *All's Lost by Lust* 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'Divers times Acted by the Lady Elizabeths Servants. And now lately by her Maiesties Servants, with great applause, at the *Phoenix* in *Drury Lane*'. See the discussion of this play below, p. 215. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

SHIRLEY, JAMES. *The School of Compliment* 1st ed. 1631, the title-page says, 'As it was acted by her Maiesties Seruants at the Priuate house in Drury Lane', but it was licensed 11 February 1624/5, 'For the Cockpit Company, A new Play, called, *Love-Tricks with Compliments*' (*Herbert*, p. 31). Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

ANONYMOUS. *The Black Lady*. Not extant. On 10 May 1622 'A new Play, called, *The Blacke Ladye*, was allowed to be acted

¹ See note on p. 195.

by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants' (*Herbert*, p. 23). See Prince Charles I's company, p. 205, n. 5, on date.

- *Love-Tricks with Compliments* (See Shirley, *The School of Compliment*)
- *The Spanish Contract* Not extant Francis Wambus set up a bill at Norwich on 26 April 1624 announcing that the Lady Elizabeth's men would act 'an excellent new Comedy called the Spanishe Contract' (Murray, II 348-9)
- *The Valiant Scholar* Not extant Licensed 3 June 1622: 'A new Play, called, *The Valiant Scholler*, allowed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants' (*Herbert*, p. 24) Fleay and others have contended that this date should be 1623, but see Prince Charles I's company, p. 205, n. 5.

CHAPTER V

PRINCE CHARLES'S (I) COMPANY

A company under the patronage of Prince Charles (then Duke of York and Duke of Albany and not actually made Prince of Wales until 3 November 1616) is found in the provinces in 1608 and 1609, but the first London record is the patent of 30 March 1610. This patent authorizes the playing of John Garland, William Rowley, Thomas Hobbes, Robert Dawes, Joseph Taylor, John Newton, and Gilbert Reason, servants to the Duke of York. So far as our knowledge goes, these men were all new to the London stage, except John Garland, who had been in the company of the Duke of Lennox. Because of Garland's presence in the patent, Professor Murray thinks this company a continuation of the Duke of Lennox's men. The suit of *Taylor v Heminges* in 1612 tells of a players' bond of 15 March 1609/10 between Garland on the one side and Taylor, Rowley, Dawes, and Hobbes on the other. Apparently the five men were leaders of the company at that time. Taylor left them for the Lady Elizabeth's company about Easter 1611.

From 1610 to 1614 the company is found in the provinces every year, and they presented plays at court every winter except that of 1613-14. Their leader seems to have been William Rowley, who wrote plays for them and acted as payee at court. After the death of Prince Henry in November 1612 and the transference of Prince Henry's men to the service of the Palsgrave, the Duke of York's company succeeded to the title of the Prince's players.

It appears that the loss of Taylor in 1611 and Dawes in 1614 to the Lady Elizabeth's men led, in 1614 or 1615, to some sort of union with that company, under Henslowe's direction. The matter is confused, as the companies seem to have led both a separate and a united existence. In March 1615 Rowley and Newton of the Prince's players seem to have represented both companies before the Privy Council, in June Rosseter was given a patent to build a theatre for the use of these two companies and the Queen's Revels, during the next winter Alexander Foster, an old Lady Elizabeth's man, was payee for the Prince's company at court; and the 1618 title-page of Field's *Amends for Ladies*, probably of this time, says that both companies acted the play. Whatever this arrangement was, it evidently came to an end at Henslowe's death in January 1615/16, and the two companies continued separately, though I think the Prince's company took in several Lady Elizabeth's men, and the latter organization was reduced to a provincial status.

THOUGH the first Elizabeth's-Prince's working agreement seems to have expired with the old promoter of the Bank-side, I think a real amalgamation of at least the principal members of the two companies—known henceforth only as the Prince's men—took place under Jacob Meade and Henslowe's son-in-law and heir, Edward Alleyn. The most

insistent evidence for this amalgamation is the complete disappearance of the metropolitan Lady Elizabeth's company¹ and the continuance of the references to Prince Charles's men. After Henslowe's death, the company of Princess Elizabeth is not heard of in London until Sir Henry Herbert lists the companies under his control in 1622. Moreover, the articles of 20 March 1615/16, by which the players of the Hope—the old Elizabeth's—Prince's—Queen's Revels association—arrange with Meade and Alleyn a settlement of their old debts to Henslowe and a continuance of the enterprise, are signed by William Rowley, John Newton, Thomas Hobbes, Joseph Taylor, Robert Hamlen, William Barksted, Robert Pallant, Hugh Attwell, William Penn, and Anthony Smith.²

The previous connexions of these ten men are significant. Rowley, Newton, Taylor, and Hobbes were named in the 1610 patent of the Prince's men,³ Taylor, Hamlen, and

¹ See above, pp. 177-9

² '[Abstract] "Articles of Agreement Indented had made concluded & agreed vpon the Twentieth daye of Marche Anno Dñi 1615 Betwene Edward Allen esq and Jacob Meade of the one pte And William Rowley Robt Pallant Joseph Taylor Robt Hamlett John Newton Hugh Ottewell Willm Backstede Thomas Hobbes Antony Smyth & William Penn gent of thother pte" whereby, the latter parties standing indebted to "Phillipp Henslowe esq deceased" and the said Jacob Meade, for loans and "playinge apparell," to the extent of £400 and upwards, the said Edward Alleyn covenants to accept in full discharge of the said debt, the sum of £200 on the following terms, namely that the latter parties "shall & will dayly & everye daye well & truly satisfye content & paye vnto the said Edward Allen his execut^{rs} administrat^{rs} and assignes the fowerth pte of all suche some & somes of monny pfit & gayne as shalbe gathered or taken by playinge or otherwise out of & for the whole galleryes of the playehouse comonly called the hope scituate in the pish of St Saviour in the countye of Surrey or in anye other howse private or publike wherein they shall playe, as the same shalbe dayly gathered or taken accordinge to the full rate & proporcion of the gayne and proffitt of the fowerth pte of the said galleryes vntill the said some of 200^{li} shalbe there wth fully satisfied & paid" and further that they "shall and will playe at the said howse called the hope, or elsewheare wth the likinge of the said Edward & Jacob accordinge to the former Articles of Agreement had & made wth the said Phillip & Jacob or eyther of them and their late pms synce in that behalfe made wth the said Edward & Jacob" and the said Edward & Jacob agreeing, furthermore, that the some of £200 being duly paid, the latter parties "shall or maye have to their owne vse all such stock of apparell as they or anye of them had or receaved of or from the said Phillip Edward & Jacob or anye of them," signed "william Rowley Robt Pallant Joseph Taylor Robt Hamlen John newton Hugh Attwell Will. Barksted Anthony Smith T hobbs william penn

Sealed & deliuered in the p^rsence of

Robert Daborne

Tho foster

: Edw: Knight:"

(*Hens Paps*, p. 90-1.)

³ Chambers, *E.S.* II. 242.

Barksted were in the first list of the Lady Elizabeth's in August 1611;¹ Pallant was a Lady Elizabeth's man in 1614,¹ Attwell and Penn belonged to the Queen's Revels and so had probably become Lady Elizabeth's men;¹ and Smith appears here for the first time.¹ That this company *was* Prince Charles's and no temporary association is shown by the fact that six of these ten men, Hamlen, Smith, Rowley, Penn, Newton, and Hobbes, were still Prince's men at the time of King James's funeral in 1625,² a seventh, Attwell, was called a Prince's man at his death in 1621,¹ and Taylor was a Prince's man until he joined the King's players between February and May 1619.¹ Of the remaining two, Barksted disappeared, and Pallant became a Queen Anne's man again.¹

This agreement of the reorganized Prince Charles's men with Alleyn and Meade seems to have been insufficient protection for their interests, for in a letter to Alleyn,³ probably

¹ See 'Players'

² See below, p. 209

³ 'Mr Allen, comendes

'S^r J hope you mistake not o^r remoouall from the bankes side we stood the intemperate weather, 'till more Jntemperate M^r Meade thrust vs over, taking the day from vs w^{ch} by course was ours, though by the time wee can yet claime none, & that power hee exacted on vs, for the prosecution of o^r further suite in a house wee entreate you to forethink well of the place, (though it craue a speedie resolution) lest wee make a second fruitlesse paines and as wee purpose to dedicate all o^r paines powers and frendes all referent to yo^r vses, so wee entreate you in the meane time, to looke toward o^r necessities, leauing you ever a certaine forme of satisfaction; wee haue neede of some monie (indeed vrdgent necessitie) w^{ch} wee rather wish you did heare in conference then by report in writing, we haue to receiue from the court (w^{ch} after shrouetide wee meane to pursue wth best speede) a great summe of monie, meane while if you'le but furnish vs wth the least halfe, w^{ch} will be fourtie poundes, it shall be all confirm'd to you till your satisfaction of the fourty what wee can do for yo^r auale or purpose, wee professe o^r readiest furtherence and you shall comand it, for w^{ch} wee entreate this kindnesse from you, still resting

Jn yo^r emploimentes
frendes to their best powers
Robt Pallant william Rowley
 Joseph Taylor
 John newton
 Robt hamlen
 Hugh Attwell
 Anthony Smyth

[Addressed:]

To o^r worthy and much respected ffrend: M^r Allen these bee dd/'
(*Hens. Paps.*, p. 93.)

Greg and Chambers think—though they do not give their reasons—that this letter was written after the agreement of 20 March 1615/16 (Chambers, *E.S.* ii. 246). Professor Murray says that it 'was obviously written shortly after Henslowe's death, during the cold winter of 1615-16, and before March 20, 1616' (Murray, i. 250, n. 5). I believe that the letter of complaint came *after* the agreement of 20 March 1615/16. In the first

written in the winter of 1616-17, they complain that Meade has taken their day from them—presumably for his bear-baiting—and thus forced them to leave the Bankside. They ask for more money and beg Alleyn to find a theatre for them.

What the harassed manager did in these circumstances is unknown,¹ but I suggest that he soon secured the Red Bull for the company.² Again the suggestion cannot be definitely established as a fact, but several circumstances point to it.

place, the agreement says that the company's theatre is the Hope, while the letter speaks of the company's recent removal from the Bankside. In the second place, I cannot imagine the players and Meade, after their serious break, coming to a new agreement which made no settlement whatever as to the days each was to have. Surely they would not invite further difficulties by making a new agreement which completely ignored the admitted cause of their previous disaster. This argument is obviously not conclusive, but it seems to me to indicate a strong probability that the articles of agreement came first.

¹ Perhaps it was at this time that there was 'a petition exhibited by the Princes comedians for setting up a playhouse' in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Whenever it was presented, the petition was rejected because eleven Justices of the Peace certified that it would be very inconvenient. The whole matter is most obscure, since it is merely referred to as a precedent by the Lord Keeper in a letter of 28 September 1626, explaining the rejection of the petition of John Williams and Thomas Dixon to build an amphitheatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields (*HEDP* 1. 444-5).

² Professor Murray, following Fleay, conjectured that the Prince's men went to the Curtain, but his only evidence is their appearance there in Herbert's book in 1622, he assumes that they had been there for five or six years (Murray, 1. 235-6). This was dubious evidence when Murray wrote, but now it is worth nothing at all, since we know now that the Prince's men were at the Cockpit at least part of the time from 1619 to 1622 (see below, p. 202, n. 6). Professor Adams thinks the company went to Rosseter's Puddle Wharf or Blackfriars theatre (Adams, p. 340), but the only evidence he gives is the title-page of *Amends for Ladies* (1618), which says it was acted at the Blackfriars both by the Prince's Servants, and the Lady Elizabeth's. Even allowing that I am all wrong about the termination of this old union and the formation of the new Prince Charles's company, one must still grant various pure conjectures to make this evidence indicate that Prince Charles's men were at Rosseter's theatre in 1616. First one must assume that, though the play was wholly or partly written in 1611 (see Chambers, *E.S.* iii. 313-14), the performance referred to on the title-page occurred in the winter of 1616-17; and secondly one must assume that the letter to Alleyn indicating the company's desertion of their Bankside theatre was written before 27 January 1616/17, when a peremptory order for the pulling down of Rosseter's theatre was issued. There are no adequate grounds for such assumptions.

There is one more suggestion for the theatre of the Prince's men after they left the Bankside. On the evidence of the entry in *S.R.* 4 July 1620 of Middleton and Rowley's masque, *The World Tossed at Tennis*, 'acted at the Princes Armes, by the Prince his highnes seruantes', Mr. W. J. Lawrence says (*T.L.S.*, 8 December 1921) that the company performed at the carriers' inn in Leadenhall Street called the Prince's Arms.

Though I cannot explain the meaning of the entry in the *S.R.*, neither can I assume with Mr. Lawrence that this inn was commonly used as a playhouse without leaving any other trace, that, with a strong and re-

To begin with, we can safely assume that Alleyn continued his interest in the company and tried to get them a theatre. They owed him £200 from their gallery takings, and he had therefore a substantial reason to be interested in their prosperity. The entries in his diary set forth below prove that his interest did continue. Now about the time when Alleyn wanted a theatre, the Red Bull became vacant. Queen Anne's men had occupied it for a number of years, but late in February 1616/17 Beeston moved them to his new Phoenix in Drury Lane.¹ This removal immediately suggests the Prince's men as likely tenants for the old theatre.

But to return to Alleyn. His continued interest in the Prince's men was mentioned above. It is hinted in the entry in his diary for 20 June 1619 which records that '4 off y^e princes men' were among his dinner guests that day,² and the entry of 5 April 1620 which relates that 'I dined w^t m^r Hewitt & ther wase y^e princes musitions m^r ball & m^r drewe'.³ His continued interest in the company is demonstrated by the entry of 10 August 1621, 'I agreed w^t they princes men for 30¹ to quitt all'.⁴ Now couple with these facts the hitherto puzzling entries in the diary about the Red Bull, 1 October 1617: 'I came to London in y^e coach & went to y^e red bull',⁵ and 3 October 1617: 'I went to y^e red bull & R^y for y^e younger brother, but 3. 6 4'.⁵ Is not the most obvious explanation of this last entry that Alleyn received as payment on the company's debt £3 6s. 4d. of the takings from their performances of *The Younger Brother* at the Red Bull?

One more piece of evidence. When, two years later at the death of Queen Anne, Beeston joined the Prince's men and moved them to the Phoenix,⁶ a new company was formed

sourceful creditor like Edward Alleyn, the Prince's men were forced to act at an inn when there were seven and later eight theatres in London and only four recognized London companies, and that a masque—even 'a substantive theatre masque'—designed for Denmark House and certain to tax the resources of even the best equipped theatre, was produced before 'many Noble and Worthy Spectators' in an innyard.

¹ See above, pp. 160-3. Though the Queen's men were forced to leave the Phoenix and perhaps to return to the Red Bull because of the damage done in the riot of 4 March 1616/17, they were back again by 4 June. Between 4 March and 4 June the two companies may have alternated at the Red Bull, or the Prince's men may have left temporarily.

² Young, II 138

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 216

³ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51

⁶ That Queen Anne's men were no longer at the Phoenix in 1619 and that Beeston joined the Prince's men in that year is established by Beeston's own statement, 23 November 1619, in his suit with John Smith, that 'after her Mat^{tes} Decease, he entred into the service of the most noble Prince

from the remnant of the patronless and houseless Queen Anne's. If Beeston had brought the Prince's men from the Red Bull, then the most likely home for the new company would have been that theatre. And so it was. The company was the Red Bull Revels company, performing at the Red Bull, which, I contend, the Prince's men had just left after occupying it since 1617.¹

The next trace of this company of players is in the 1619 edition of *The Inner Temple Mask, or Mask of Heroes*, presented at the Inner Temple between 6 January and 2 February 1618/19,² in which the speaking parts are assigned to five Prince's men, 'Ios. Taylor. W. Rowley. I. Newton. H. Atwell. W. Carpenter'.³ What connexion, if any, the Charles' (Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p. 40) The Phoenix theatre seems always to have been Beeston's own property and occupied by his company. Though he was a Princess Elizabeth's man in 1622, for he stands first in Herbert's list of that company, he seems not to have been a member much earlier, as his name is not mentioned in the patent of March 1621/2. It would seem, therefore, that Prince Charles's men probably occupied the Phoenix from 1619 to 1622, and that the title-page of *The Witch of Edmonton*, which says, 'Acted by the Princes Servants, often at the Cock-Pit in Drury-Lane', refers to this period.

¹ It seems to me probable that the following document (from *Hens Paps*, p. 126) pertains to the activities of Prince Charles's men about this time: 'Wee are well contented wth that agreement wch was concluded betwene you and o^r fellow Tailor wch was five and fiftye pounde Wee desire that the clothes may bee here to morrow morning. and bonds shall be sealde for the paiement of it

William Rowley
Joseph Taylor
Rob pallant'

The document, according to Dr. Greg, is in the hand of William Rowley, and part of Pallant's name and probably others which followed have been torn away.

Dr. Greg dates this document c. 1613 and assigns it to the Lady Elizabeth's company. This assignment seems to me erroneous, because Rowley, who signs as leader, was never a Lady Elizabeth's man. The other two were, but Pallant is never found among the leaders of the company. Furthermore, at the time Dr. Greg suggests, Nathan Field always appeared as leader of the Lady Elizabeth's men, and he is not in this list at all.

Rowley, who signs as leader and in whose hand the document is written, always appears as a leader of Prince Charles's men 1610-19, in fact, Rowley and Newton are the only players whose names occur in all lists of Prince Charles's men in this period. Finally, in two documents of 1616 these three men appear as the three leaders of Prince Charles's company. These facts seem to me to provide good grounds for assigning the document to Prince Charles's players, 1616-19.

² The date is fixed by the text itself, which refers (B₁) to Twelfth Night as past and to Candlemas as still in the future (A₁^v and B₂).

³ Though Carpenter had not signed any of the earlier agreements of the company as an actor-sharer, he was a Prince's man in 1625 when the members of the company were given a cloth allowance for King James's funeral procession. Since he had been a Lady Elizabeth's man in 1611, he had probably become a Prince's man at the amalgamation.

company as a whole had with this production it is impossible to state.

The acquisition of Christopher Beeston and the removal to the Phoenix¹ (probably some time between March and November 1619) must have marked a change for the better in the affairs of the company. They became attached to a new² and well-situated theatre; they acquired an active and successful manager in Beeston, they probably succeeded to part of the wardrobe of Queen Anne's company, if the statement of Perkins, Worth, and Cumber that Beeston made off with the company's costumes is to be trusted;³ and it is quite likely that they fell heir to some of the plays of the disbanded Queen's company.⁴

Not long after their removal to the Phoenix, the company got into difficulties over an uncensored play given at court in the Christmas season of 1619-20. The affair is known only from a letter of the Venetian ambassador, which seems to indicate that the production took place early in January. He wrote to the Doge and Senate, 10 January 1619/20, as follows:

In connection with the subject of comedians, I ought not to conceal the following event from your Serenity, owing to the mystery that it involves. The comedians of the prince, in the presence of the king his father, played a drama the other day in which a king with his two sons has one of them put to death, simply upon suspicion that he wished to deprive him of his crown, and the other son actually did deprive him of it afterwards. This moved the king in an extraordinary manner, both inwardly and outwardly. In this country however the comedians have absolute liberty to say whatever they wish against any one soever, so the only demonstration against them will be the words spoken by the king.⁵

No doubt the players would have been greatly amused at the ambassador's statement about their 'absolute liberty',

¹ This removal to the Phoenix accounts for the title-page of the 1658 edition of *The Witch of Edmonton*, which says, 'Acted by the Princes Servants, often at the Cock-Pit in Drury-Lane'. This assignment of the Prince's men to the Cockpit greatly troubled Professor Murray (Murray, i 236, n. 3), who did not know that the Prince's players had ever been at that theatre and who was forced to assume that the title-page confused the Prince's with Queen Henrietta's men.

² Adams, pp 348-51

³ See the Answer of Worth, Cumber, and Perkins to John Smith's suit, Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p 38

⁴ Beeston seems to have had a profitable custom of retaining at least some of the plays of the companies which left his theatre. See the repertories of Queen Henrietta's company and Beeston's Boys.

⁵ C.S.P., Ven., 1619-21, p. 111.

but we have no evidence of their punishment for this offence. Mr. W. J. Lawrence thinks that the company's masque of *The World Tossed at Tennis* was denied a court performance because of this affront to the king,¹ but his suggestion is pure conjecture.

The Prince's men were probably still under Beeston's management at the Cockpit when they presented *The Man in the Moon Drinks Claret* at court on 27 December 1621² and *The Witch of Edmonton* two days later.³

But the days of the company's sojourn at the Cockpit were numbered. By the middle of 1622 they had gone to the Curtain and had been succeeded at the Phoenix by a new Princess Elizabeth's company.⁴ The evidence for this transfer seems complete. Malone says, in enumerating the London companies in 1622, 'The Prince's Servants, who performed then at the Curtain'.⁵ In Herbert's list of the London companies in 1622 the Lady Elizabeth's men are located at the Phoenix—the part of the list which presumably showed the Prince's company at the Curtain has mouldered away. And on 10 June 1622⁶ Herbert allowed a new play called *The Dutch Painter and the French Brawle* for 'the Princes Servants at the Curtayne'.⁶

On 6 January 1622/3, the company presented *A Vow and a Good One* at court.⁷

At this point, a series of entries from Sir Henry Herbert's

¹ See his 'Early Substantive Theatre Masques', *T.L.S.*, 8 December 1921.

² MS 515, No. 7, Inner Temple Library, reprinted Murray, II 193.

³ One wonders if at the Curtain the Prince's men were still in part under the control of Beeston. This query is prompted by Mr. Hotson's note (Hotson, p. 92) that he has found a late Chancery suit which indicates that the Shoreditch property mentioned in Beeston's will (see Appendix, p. 632) included the Curtain estate. It is possible that he owned that theatre in 1622 and simply transferred the Prince's men from one of his playhouses to the other.

⁴ *Variorum*, III 57-9. It may be to this period of the company's occupancy of the Curtain that the rape-seed joke about William Rowley at the Curtain refers. (See 'Players'.)

⁵ Fleay and others have thought this date and those of the three preceding plays (*The Black Lady*, *The Welsh Traveller*, and *The Valiant Scholar*) should be 1623, because the 'players of the Revels' who are the licensees of one of the four plays in question were not granted a patent until 8 July 1622. However, the patent in question is for the 'Children of the Revels', not the 'players' of the Revels, and even assuming that the two companies were the same, which is highly improbable (see above, pp. 167-9 and W. J. Lawrence in *M.L.R.*, October, 1919), it is not unprecedented for a company to function before it had been officially born. I see no reason to question the dates.

⁶ *Herbert*, p. 24. See below, p. 216.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

office-book sets a pretty puzzle about the occupants of the Curtain and the Red Bull. The pertinent entries are as follows.

1623, July 30 'For the Prince's Players, A French Tragedy of *the Bellman of Paris*, written by Thomas Dekkers and John Day, for the Company of the Red Bull'

1623, Aug 'For the Company at the Curtain, A Tragedy of *the Plantation of Virginia; the profaneness to be left out*, otherwise not tolerated'

1623, Aug 19 'For the Prince's Servants of the Red Bull, an Oulde Playe, called, *The Peaceable King, or the Lord Mendall*, which was formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke, and likewise by me'

1623, Sept 12. 'For the Lady Elizabeth's Players, a new Comedy, called, *The Cra . . . Marchant, or Come to my Country house*; Written by William Bonen. It was acted at the Red Bull, and licensed without my hand to itt, because they were none of the *four Companies*'

1623, Sept. 18. 'For a Company of Strangers, a new Comedy, called, *Come see a Wonder*, Written by John Deye.'

1623, Oct. 2 'For the Prince's Companye; a new Comedy, called, *A Fault in Friendship*. Written by Young Johnson, and Broome.'

1623, Nov 28. 'For a Strange Company at the Red Bull, *The Faiyre fowle one, or The bayting of the Jealous Knight*. Written by Smith.¹

The worst of the difficulties is resolved by Professor Adams's suggestion, derived from Fleay and strongly supported by Malone's comment on the play, that the last sentence of the entry for 12 September 1623 was misplaced by Chalmers and really belongs to the play called *Come See a Wonder*.² This suggestion is quite plausible, since the Lady Elizabeth's men certainly *were* one of the four companies, and the strangers were at the Red Bull two months later. Although four or five more plays are licensed for the Prince's company before 1625, none of the entries mentions a theatre.³ Professor Murray suggests that the first entry concerns a play licensed to the Revels company and by them sold to the

¹ Herbert, pp. 24-6.

² Ibid., pp 25-6.

³ *The Four Sons of Amon*, 6 January 1623/4; *The Madcap*, 3 May 1624; *The Parricide*, 27 May 1624, *The Fairy Knight*, 11 June 1624 (probably a Prince's company play; see Herbert, p. 29); *The Widow's Prize*, 25 January 1624/5. See Herbert, pp 27, 28, 29, and 30.

Prince's men, or, alternatively, that in the second entry Herbert had forgotten that the Prince's players had left the Curtain.¹

I hesitate to accept either conclusion. The first entry sounds to me more like redundancy than an attempt to explain the transfer of a play, and as for the second, I am loath to dodge the consequences of our inadequate knowledge by accusing Herbert of errors. I think that we must assume that the first entry indicates the Prince's removal from the Curtain to the Red Bull; that the second refers to the new occupants of the Curtain, whoever they were; and that the items of 18 September and 28 November indicate a new company which performed at the Red Bull. It is possible that the Prince's players moved into the Red Bull when it was made vacant by the break-up of the players of the Revels (referred to in the Baskerville papers)² and left it again at the advent of the new company. But I think it more likely that the new company played only occasionally and perhaps at various theatres, as did the French company in 1629 and 1635³ and the young men of the City who used this same theatre in 1613.⁴

Some small support for this notion that the Prince's men continued at the Red Bull is furnished by a statement of John Gee in his *New Shreds of the Old Snare*, entered in the Stationers' Register 24 May 1624.

But the *Iesuites* being or having *Actors* of such dexteritie, I see no reason but that they should set vp a company for themselves, which surely will put down *The Fortune*, *Red-Bull*, *Cock-pit*, & *Globe*.⁵

It is noteworthy that in this statement Gee names just four theatres and that four London companies are known to have been performing in 1624. He omits the Curtain and the Blackfriars; the former, I suggest, because it was not in 1624 the regular house of one of the four companies, the latter, though it was the best known theatre in London, because it was simply an additional house for the King's men. Thus Gee may be taken to refer to the King's men as the occupants

¹ Murray, i. 237.

² Fleay, *Stage*, pp. 270-97.

³ See *Herbert*, pp. 59-61.

⁴ See the 1615 title-page of *The Hector of Germany*. 'As it hath beene publickly Acted at the Red Bull, and at the Curtaene, by a Companie of Young Men of this Citie,' and the 1614 title-page of *The Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*. 'Divers times Publickly acted, by certaine London Prentices'

⁵ 1624 quarto, p. 17.

of the Globe, the Palsgrave's as occupants of the Fortune, the Lady Elizabeth's men as occupants of the Cockpit. All these assignments are familiar to us from other sources. His fourth theatre is the Red Bull, and since we know that the fourth company was Prince Charles's men, it seems probable that Gee was referring to them as the occupants of that theatre. It would, of course, be a mistake to insist on Gee's theatrical accuracy, but his pamphlet is filled with theatrical references, and his mention of just four London theatres, neglecting the Curtain and the Blackfriars, seems purposeful.

A slight additional reason to believe that the Prince's men continued at the Red Bull is furnished by the suggestion that the Prince's company was the one which presented *The Late Murder in Whitechapel or Keep the Widow Waking*¹ at the Red Bull in September 1624. The interesting Star Chamber case concerning this play which Mr. Sisson has brought to light² does not name the company which presented it, and the references to the actors are confusing. William Rowley, William Carpenter, and Ellis Worth were named among the defendants, but Rowley was brought in as one of the authors, and neither he nor Carpenter gave evidence, nor was there any other evidence implicating Carpenter. Worth gave evidence, but insisted that he had not acted in the play, had had nothing to do with it, had not seen it, and did not even know when or how often the play had been acted. Since it was generally known that the play had been acted at the Red Bull, and since Thomas Dekker testified concerning its composition and performances, Worth's sweeping denials would certainly have been challenged had he actually been connected with the Red Bull at this time. He was doubtless called because of his long previous connexion with the Red Bull as a member of Queen Anne's and the Red Bull Revels, but other evidence makes it likely that he had not appeared there since the break-up of the Revels company in 1623. These facts, then, remain: Carpenter and Rowley, both Prince's men in the official list given six months later,³ were mentioned in connexion with the play. Carpenter's part was not proved, but it was not denied. Dekker and Worth admitted Rowley's part in the writing of the play, though the

¹ Obviously *A Late Murther of the Sonn upon the Mother*, which Herbert licensed without mentioning the company in September 1624. (See Herbert, p. 29.)

² Sisson, *Keep the Widow Waking*.

³ See below, p. 211.

actor-dramatist was not called, apparently because he had died during the course of the trial.¹ Moreover Dekker, Ford, and Rowley, who collaborated on *Keep the Widow Waking*, had collaborated on a similar topical play for the Prince's men in *The Witch of Edmonton* three years before, and Dekker had collaborated in *The Bellman of Paris* for them about a year before. Dekker, who testified as to his part in *Keep the Widow Waking*, certainly was writing for the Prince's men at this time. Slight as this evidence is, it points more clearly to Prince Charles's players than to any other organization.

We last hear of the Prince's company in the Lord Chamberlain's accounts for the funeral of King James, which took place 7 May 1625, though it had been planned for 5 May. In the book labelled 'The President of the Funerall of our late Dread Soueraigne of Blessed Memory King Iames' the following list is found:

The Chamber of our Dread Soueraigne Lord King Charles—
Comaedians

Robert Hamlett—iiij yards

Anthonie Smith—iiij yards

William Rowley—iiij yards

William Carpenter—iiij yards

William Penn—iiij yards

Iohn Newton—iiij yards

Gilbert Raison—iiij yards

Thomas Hobbs—iiij yards²

All these men had appeared with the Prince's company before, and all but Reason and Carpenter had signed the agreement with Alleyn and Meade in March 1615/16.

Apparently the company broke up when Prince Charles succeeded to the throne and took over his father's company. With the loss of their patron came the loss of several important players who were taken into the King's company. Rowley had been connected with King James's men for about two years at this time.³ Hobbes petitioned to be sworn a King's man in May 1625.⁴ Mr. Baldwin's inference that Penn

¹ See Sisson, *Keep the Widow Waking*, pp. 237-8

² *M S C. 11*, 326. This list is the only one which names Reason with the London company 1616-25. He is found regularly in the provinces as a leader of the provincial Prince's company. (See 'Players'.)

³ See 'Players'. The presence of Rowley's name in the Prince's list for King James's funeral and its absence from the King's list probably indicates that he had not yet been sworn as a member of the King's company, in spite of his appearance with them.

⁴ See 'Players'.

and Smith, who certainly were King's men later, first came to that company at this time seems reasonable.¹ Carpenter, Hamlen, Reason, and Newton disappear after 1625.² The conclusion that the old Prince Charles's company was unable to survive the loss of its patron, the desertion of four principal members, and the eight months plague closing in 1625³ seems inescapable.

LISTS AND TABLES

The lists and tables which follow have been prepared on the same principles as those which accompany the King's, Queen's, and Palsgrave's companies. The sources for the various lists of players of Prince Charles's company are as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. <i>M S.C</i> i 272-4 | 5 1619 quarto of Middleton's |
| 2. <i>Hens. Paps</i> , pp 90-1. | <i>Inner Temple Masque</i> . |
| 3 <i>Ibid.</i> , p. 93 | 6 <i>M S C.</i> ii 325-6 |
| 4. <i>Ibid.</i> , p 126 | |

¹ See Baldwin, *Organization*, p 55

² See 'Players'

³ See Plague Appendix, pp. 654-7

ACTOR LISTS

<i>Actors</i>	1 <i>Patent of 30 Mar 1610</i>	2 <i>Signed bond to Henslowe and Meade 20 Mar 1615/16</i>	3 <i>Signed letter to Alleyn 1616</i>	4 <i>Signed letter about costumes 1616-17</i>	5 <i>Roles in Inner Temple Masque Jan or Feb 1618/19</i>	6 <i>Livery allowance King James's Funeral 7 May 1625</i>
John Garland	1	1	2	1	Plum Porridge	3
William Rowley	2	1	2	1		8
Thomas Hobbes	3	9 ^a
Robert Dawes	4
Joseph Taylor	5	3	3	2	Dr. Almanac	6
John Newton	6	5	4	..	A Fasting Day	7
Gilbert Reason	7
Robert Pallant	..	2	1	3		1
Robert Hamlen	..	4	5	..	New Year	..
Hugh Attwell	..	6	6	..		2
William Barksled	..	7	7	..		5
Anthony Smith	..	8 ^a		4
William Penn	..	10	Time	.
William Carpenter
Christopher Beeston ^b

^a Though Hobbes and Smith are eighth and ninth respectively to sign the bond, the order of their names is reversed in the body of the document

^b Beeston does not appear in any list of the company, but he said in his reply to the complaint of John Smith, 23 November 1619, that after the death of Queen Anne (2 March 1615/19) he had entered into the service of Prince Charles, (Wallace, *Three Theatres*, p. 40)

PROVINCIAL NOTICES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
16 Mar 1615/16-13 Apr 1616	Dover	Murray, II 265
30 Mar 1616	Norwich	Ibid, pp 340-1
29 Nov 1615-27 Nov 1616	Coventry ¹	Ibid, p 247
5 Nov. 1615-4 Nov 1616	Southampton	Ibid, p 399
15 Aug 1616	Dunwich	<i>Hist MSS Com, Records of</i> <i>... Dunwich</i> , p 93
28 Aug 1616	Oxford	Boas, p 31
1616-17	Nottingham	Murray, II 376
1616-17	Shrewsbury	Ibid, p. 393
1616-17	Barnstaple	Ibid, p 199
1616-17	Southampton	Ibid, p. 399
1616-17 (probably spring 1617)	Saffron Walden	<i>N & Q</i> , Series X, XII (1909), 42
15 May 1617	Coventry	Murray, II. 247
22 July 1617	Marlborough	Ibid, p 333
24 Oct 1617	Exeter	Ibid, p 272
1617-18	Barnstaple	Ibid, p. 199
1617-18	Plymouth	Ibid, p 385
1617-18	Winchester	Ibid, p 406
1618, Midsummer-Michaelmas	Bristol	Ibid, p 218
30 Nov 1618	Reading	<i>Hist MSS Com</i> , Report XI, Part VII, p 210
1618-19	Ipswich ²	<i>M.S.C.</i> II 283
28 Sept 1619	Craven District	Murray, II 255
30 Oct 1619	Coventry	Ibid, p 248
1619	Leicester ¹	Ibid, p 313
<9 Mar. 1619/20	Marlborough	Ibid, p. 334
1619-20	Ipswich	<i>M.S.C.</i> II 283
13 May-5 Aug. 1620	Dover	Murray, II. 266
12 Aug 1620	Coventry	Ibid., p 248
1620	Leicester	Ibid., p. 313
Dec 1620	Nottingham	Ibid., p. 376
1620-1	Ipswich	<i>M.S.C.</i> II 284
1620-1	Norwich	Murray, II. 370
1620-1	Marlborough	Ibid, p. 334
1620-1 (probably spring 1621)	Saffron Walden	<i>N. & Q.</i> , Series X, XII (1909), 42
16 Feb. 1620/1	Naworth Castle	Murray, II 334
24 Feb 1620/1-24 May 1621	Dover	Ibid, p. 266
1621-2 (probably autumn 1621)	Saffron Walden	<i>N & Q</i> , Series X, XII (1909), 42
24 Aug. 1621	Coventry	Murray, II 249
29 Sept -1 Dec. 1621	Dover	Ibid, p 266
9 Nov. 1621	Leicester	Ibid, p 314
1621-2	Barnstaple	Ibid, p 199
c Mar 30, 1622	Dover	Ibid, p. 266
15 Mar.-15 Aug 1622	Marlborough	Ibid, p 334

¹ Two visits² The entry reads, 'To the Ladye Elizabeth's plaiers & the princes plaiers', but since the reward paid was double the usual amount, it is not likely that we have a combined company noticed here, but simply two separate payments entered together.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
< 26 Aug 1622	Leicester	Murray, II 315
23 Dec 1622	Coventry	Ibid, p 249
15 Jan 1622/3	Stafford	Ibid, p 401
31 May 1623	Norwich	Ibid., p. 347
27 Oct 1623	Leicester	Ibid, p 315
1623-4	Nottingham	Ibid, p 377
17 Apr-15 May 1624	Dover	Ibid, p 266
1624, autumn	Saffron Walden	N & Q, Series X, xii (1909), 42
30 Oct-27 Nov 1624	Dover	Murray, II 266
16 Nov 1624	Canterbury	Ibid, p 232
23 Dec 1624	Coventry	Ibid, p 250
29 Jan 1624/5	Norwich	Ibid, p 351
1624-5	Winchester	Ibid, p. 406
1625	Leicester	Ibid, p. 316
c end of James I's reign	Bridport	Ibid, p. 206

PLAYS GIVEN AT COURT BY PRINCE CHARLES'S (I) COMPANY

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
> 1617 ^a	<i>A Fair Quarrel</i>	..	.	1617 title-page
c 10 Jan. 1619/20	[Unknown] ^b	..	.	C S P, Ven, 1619- 21, p. 111
27 Dec. 1621	<i>The Man in the Moon Drinks Claret</i>	£10	6 Mar 1621/2	Murray, II 193, <i>Plays and Masques</i> p 214
29 Dec. 1621	<i>The Witch of Edmonton</i>	£10	6 Mar. 1621/2	Ibid.
6 Jan 1622/3	<i>A Vow and a Good One</i>	..		Herbert, p. 50

^a It has several times been suggested that the first edition of 1617 was prompted by a court performance in the winter of 1616-17. Though the suggestion is a likely one, there is no evidence that the court performance referred to on the title-page had taken place in the winter preceding publication.

^b 'The comedians of the prince, in the presence of the king his father, played a drama the other day in which a king with his two sons has one of them put to death, simply upon suspicion that he wished to deprive him of his crown, and the other son actually did deprive him of it afterwards.' F. T. Bowers (*M.L.N.* lii [1937], 192-6) argues most unconvincingly that the play was Glapthorne's *Revenge for Honour*. Not only do all the facts we have about Glapthorne and the play cry out against this identification (see J. H. Walter, *R.E.S.* xiii [1937], 425-37), but Chester Linn Shaver has pointed out (*M.L.N.* lxx [1938], 96-8) that Greville's *Alaham* fits the description better than *Revenge for Honour* anyhow.

PLAYS PRESENTED BY PRINCE CHARLES'S (I)
COMPANY AFTER 1615

- BARNES, ——— *The Madcap* Not extant Licensed 3 May 1624.
'For the Prince's Company, A New Play, called, *The Madcap*:
Written by Barnes' (Herbert, p. 28.)
- BROME and JONSON *A Fault in Friendship* Not extant Licensed
2 October 1623: 'For the Prince's Companye, a new Comedy,
called, *A Fault in Friendship* Written by Young Johnson,
and Broome.' (Herbert, p. 26)
- CHAPMAN, GEORGE *Revenge for Honour*. (See ANON, *The Parricide*)
- DEKKER and DAY. *The Bellman of Paris* Not extant Licensed
30 July 1623: 'For the Prince's Players, A French Tragedy
of *the Bellman of Paris*, written by Thomas Dekkirs and
John Day, for the Company of the Red Bull' (Herbert, p. 24)
- DEKKER and FORD *The Fairy Knight* Not extant. Licensed
11 June 1624. 'A new play, called, *The Fairy Knight*
Written by Forde, and Decker.' (Herbert, p. 29) In a note
Professor Adams says, 'Presumably this play was licensed
to the Prince's Company, whose name appears just above'
- DEKKER, FORD, and ROWLEY. *The Witch of Edmonton* 1st ed.
1658; the title-page says, 'Acted by the Princes Servants, often
at the Cock-Pit in *Drury-Lane*, once at Court, with singular
Applause'. Produced by the Prince's men at court 29 Decem-
ber 1621 (Murray, ii. 193), see above, p. 205, and below, p. 251
- DEKKER, FORD, ROWLEY, and WEBSTER *The Late Murder in
Whitechapel, or Keep the Widow Waking* Not extant
Licensed 3-15 September 1624: 'A new Tragedy, called, *A
Late Murther of the Sonn upon the Mother* Written by Forde,
and Webster.' (Herbert, p. 29) In a note Professor Adams
says, 'Presumably . . . the play was licensed to the Cockpit
Company, mentioned in the immediately preceding entry.'
But he is mistaken. The play, which Dekker called 'The
late Murder in White Chappell, or, Keepe the Widow waking',
was acted at the Red Bull, apparently by Prince Charles's
men. (See above, pp. 208-9).
- GLAPTHORNE, HENRY. *The Parricide*. (See ANONYMOUS)
- MIDDLETON and ROWLEY. *The World Tossed at Tennis*. 1st ed.
1620; the title-page, which calls the play *A Courtly Masque*:
The Deuice Called, The World tost at Tennis, says, 'As it hath
beene diuers times Presented to the Contentment of many
Noble and Worthy Spectators, By the Prince his Seruants.'
The entry in the S R., 4 July 1620, says, 'acted at the Princes
Armes, by the Prince his highnes seruantes'. The prologue
implies that it was performed publicly and not at court as
intended. (See above, p. 201, n. 2.)

— *A Fair Quarrel* 1st ed 1617, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted before the King and diuers times publickly by the Prince his Highnes Seruants' 'A ffaire Quarrell' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance (see Marcham, *Revels*, p. 15, and Sir Edmund Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 482 and 484) Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

ROWLEY, WILLIAM. *All's Lost by Lust* 1st ed 1633, the title-page says, '*Divers times Acted by the Lady Elizabeths Servants. And now lately by her Maesties Servants, with great applause, at the Phoenix in Drury Lane*'. Though there is no mention of Prince Charles's men on the title-page, the dramatis personae of the first edition has '*Iaques, a simple clownish Gentleman, his sonne, personated by the Poet*'. Now Rowley was never a member of either the Lady Elizabeth's¹ or Queen Henrietta's company. He was, however, long a member of Prince Charles's company. *The Witch of Edmonton* and *A Fair Quarrel*, both Prince Charles's plays, passed from that company to the Lady Elizabeth's company to Queen Henrietta's company, and it seems to me likely that this play had the same history. When the play was printed, Rowley's old company had been extinct for eight years, and a quite different company with the same name was playing in London. It is not surprising, therefore, that the name of the original company did not appear on the title-page of the play. '*All's Lost by Lust*' appears in a list of plays on waste paper of the Revels Office, probably dating about 1619 or 1620. It has been plausibly suggested that the plays of the list were being considered for court performance (see Marcham, *Revels*, p. 15, and E. K. Chambers, *R.E.S.* i. 482 and 484) The appearance of the play in this list indicates that it must have been produced before 1623, the date selected by Stork (*Rowley*, p. 30), and fits well with the notion that it was first produced by Prince Charles's men, for that company occupied the Cockpit 1619-22, and Lady Elizabeth's company was only a provincial organization in the years 1616-22. The play remained in Beeston's hands after Queen Henrietta's men left his theatre, for the Lord Chamberlain protected it for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

¹ Rowley might possibly have been considered a Lady Elizabeth's man in 1615 when Prince Charles's men and Lady Elizabeth's men were acting together. I do not think, however, that *All's Lost by Lust* dates so early as 1615.

SAMPSON, WILLIAM *The Widow's Prize* Not extant Licensed 25 January 1624/5 'For the Prince's Company; A new Play, called, *The Widow's Prize*', and censored by Herbert (*Herbert*, p. 30) On 9 September 1653 'The Widdowes Prize, by Mr W^m Samson' was entered to Humphrey Moseley with thirty-nine other plays

ANONYMOUS *The Dutch Painter and the French Brawle* Not extant Licensed 10 June 1622: 'A new Play, called, *The Duche Painter, and the French Branke*, was allowed to be acted by the Princes Servants at the Curtayne' (*Herbert*, p. 24) The title occurs in Hill's list of plays in MS ('Hill's MS Plays', pp. 74 and 91-2), and, as Professor Adams points out, since brawle makes sense and branke does not, it seems likely that Chalmers made a mistake in transcription of the entry from Herbert's office-book.

— *The Four Sons of Anon.* Not extant Licensed 6 January 1623/4: 'For the Prince's Company, *The Four Sons of Amon*; being an Old Playe, and not of a legible hand' Mentioned in *Henslowe's Diary* 10 December 1602 (*Herbert*, p. 27, and *Hens D.* ii 227)

— *The Man in the Moon Drinks Claret* Not extant On 6 March 1621/2 a warrant was issued for a payment 'to the Princes Servaunts [for presenting a play at court on] 27^o Decembris 1621, called the man in the moone drinks Clarrett'. (*Murray*, ii 193)

— *The Parricide* Not extant. Licensed 27 May 1624 'For the Prince's Company, A Play, called, *The Parracide*.' (*Herbert*, p. 28) *The Parricide, or Revenge for Honour* by Glapthorne was entered S.R. 29 November 1653, but Professor J. H. Walter has pretty well destroyed the grounds for the identification of the two titles (*R.E.S.* xiii 425-37), the S.R. entry was probably just an attempt to get two plays through as one, or *The Parricide* may even have been Glapthorne's original title for *Revenge for Honour*, since the term is common enough. *The Parricide* of 1624 certainly cannot have been written by Glapthorne, who was thirteen years old at the time and had just matriculated at Corpus Christi, Cambridge.

— *The Peaceable King, or The Lord Mendall.* Not extant. Licensed 19 August 1623: 'For the Prince's Servants of the Red Bull; an Oulde Playe, called, *The Peaceable King; or the Lord Mendall*, which was formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke, and likewise by me.' (*Herbert*, pp. 24-5.)

— *A Vow and a Good One.* Not extant. Acted at court 6 January 1622/3: 'Upon Twelwe night, the Masque being put off, the play called *A Vowe and a Good One* was acted by the princes servants.' (*Herbert*, p. 50.)

. *The Younger Brother* Not extant. Entered S R. 29 December 1653. If I am right in my conjecture that Prince Charles's men were acting at the Red Bull in October 1617, then they were the company which acted this play, on which Alleyn received payment in that month 'I went to y^e red bull & R for y^e younger brother, but 3. 6 4.' (Young, II 51.) See above, pp. 201-3. The title occurs in Hill's list of plays in MS ('Hill's MS Plays', pp. 74 and 91-2), and the play referred to may be this one.

CHAPTER VI

QUEEN HENRIETTA'S COMPANY

THE origins of this company are obscure, for the first patent of the new organization has not been discovered, and the earliest references to it are not so precise as one could wish. The most definite early reference is Malone's statement from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book that, under the date 5 July 1627, 'The Great Duke was licensed for the Queen's Servants'.¹ Unfortunately Malone's statement is not a direct quotation from the office-book and may rest on an inference. We have indirect evidence for an earlier date on the title-page of the 1629 quarto of Shirley's *Wedding*, which says that the play was 'lately Acted by her Maiesties Seruants, at the Phenix in Drury Lane'. Fleay showed that *The Wedding* contains a reference to a performance on 31 May 1626,² and presumably that performance was given by Queen Henrietta's men.³

In the face of these uncertainties we can state only what seem to be the probabilities of the organization of Queen Henrietta's men. Since Christopher Beeston managed the new company, as he had all previous companies at the Cockpit, it is probable that he organized the troupe. The most likely time would have been the long period of plague-enforced idleness in 1625. Not only were the theatres closed for a period of at least eight months in this year,⁴ but there were at the time political events which offered a likely opportunity for the launching of the new company. Charles I had succeeded to the throne on the 27th of March, and shortly after, on the 1st of May, his marriage with Henrietta Maria of France was celebrated by proxy in Paris.⁵ On the 12th of June the new Queen landed at Dover, and on the 16th she

¹ *Variorum*, in. 230.

² Fleay, *Biog Chron.* II. 236.

³ It is possible to argue that we have evidence for a still earlier date in the licence of Shirley's *Maid's Revenge* on 9 February 1625/6 (*Herbert*, p. 31). Though no company is mentioned in the licence, the play was published in 1639 as a Queen's play, and presumably the licence was procured for that company. But such reasoning as this is not trustworthy, as can be demonstrated by treating Massinger's *Renegado* in the same way. This play was published in 1630 as a Queen's play, but it had been licensed 'For the Cockpit' on 17 April 1624, a full year before Henrietta was married to Charles and before a company under her patronage could even have been thought of.

⁴ See Appendix, pp. 654-7.

⁵ *D N B.*

and Charles were received enthusiastically in London.¹ The auspiciousness of the moment for the launching of a company under the patronage of the new Queen probably did not escape Beeston. The new patent for the King's company was issued 24 June 1625,² and it seems probable that Queen Henrietta's men were licensed about the same time.³

It is generally said that the new Queen Henrietta's company was formed from the old Lady Elizabeth's men, and though this statement is not wholly false, it is somewhat misleading. The assumption is an easy one, since both companies were managed by Christopher Beeston, both performed at the Cockpit, and both included William Sherlock and Anthony Turner, and since a number of the plays once owned by Lady Elizabeth's company are later found in the repertory of Queen Henrietta's men.⁴ Yet the evidence indicates that however much Beeston may have pillaged the old company for the new one, Queen Henrietta's company was by no means the Lady Elizabeth's players with a new patent. Only three men are known to have belonged to both companies, Beeston, Turner, and Sherlock. Of the other Lady Elizabeth's men listed by Sir Henry Herbert in 1622, Swanston belonged to the King's company by December 1624, Cane was a Palsgrave's man in April 1624, Greville was a King's man by October 1626, and Moore seems to have continued with a provincial Lady Elizabeth's company. The hired men known from MS. stage directions do not appear again.⁵

Not only do the majority of Lady Elizabeth's men fail to appear in Queen Henrietta's company, but as many members of the new organization came from the old Queen Anne-Revels company as from the Lady Elizabeth's. From the

¹ Gardiner, v. 333-4.

² See above, pp. 17-18.

³ The conjecture that it was Beeston who chose the occasion of the plague closing to get rid of the Lady Elizabeth's players and to form a new company under a new patronage for the Phoenix is given some support by the fact that he did almost exactly the same thing during the plague closing of 1636-7 when he broke the Queen's company and formed Beeston's Boys for the Phoenix, retaining certain favoured members of the old Queen Henrietta's troupe for the new Beeston's Boys, just as in 1625 he had retained certain of the old Lady Elizabeth's men for the new Queen Henrietta's company. See below, pp. 326-7.

⁴ Such plays as *The Changeling*, *The Spanish Gipsy*, *All's Lost by Lust*, *The School of Compliment*, *The City Nightcap*, *The Renegado*.

⁵ See above, pp. 186-8, and 'Players'. Several unknown members of Lady Elizabeth's company evidently became part of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company (see below, pp. 260-9).

casts of three plays (*The Renegado*, *The Wedding*, and the two parts of *The Fair Maid of the West*) performed by Queen Henrietta's men in the first five or six years of the history of the company, we have the names of twenty actors—sixteen men Richard Perkins, Michael Bowyer, John Sumner, William Sherlock, Anthony Turner, William Allen, William Robbins (or Robinson), William Wilbraham, John Young, John Dobson, Timothy Reade, Robert Axen (or Axell, or Jackson), Christopher Goad, John Blaney, William Reignolds, Edward Shakerley; and four boys: John Page, Hugh Clark, Edward Rogers, and Theophilus Bird. Only five of these men have known company affiliations before they appear in Queen Henrietta's casts: Sherlock and Turner are named in Sir Henry Herbert's 1622 list of the seven chief men at the Phoenix (Lady Elizabeth's company), Blaney appears in Queen Anne's and derivative organizations from 1610 to 1622; Robbins is found with the same troupes from 1616 to 1625; and Perkins with the same troupes 1603 to 1623, though the livery lists indicate that he was a King's man in 1623 or 1624 and in 1625. None of the fifteen other men and boys appears with any earlier company, though Allen may have been a servant of Beeston's,¹ and if so he probably performed with Lady Elizabeth's men.

The large number of hitherto unknown actors in these lists makes conclusions about the origins of the new company very hazardous, but the presence of several former Queen Anne's men (a company to which Beeston himself had belonged for seventeen years) is noteworthy. When one remembers the suggestions of Beeston's continued interest in the Red Bull,² the theatre in which these men had once performed, one is inclined to suspect that the manager of the Cockpit had drawn from the two companies in which he was interested to form a third.

There are certain rather puzzling implications about this company in the cast which was printed in the first (1630) quarto of Massinger's *Renegado*. This cast, I believe, is the earliest list of the company. The play had been licensed for performance at the Cockpit 17 April 1624,³ presumably for the Lady Elizabeth's company, though the title-page says 'often acted by the Queenes Maiesties seruants, at the priuate Play-house in *Drurye-Lane*'. I suppose that the play had

¹ See 'Players'.

² See above, pp 163 and 202-3.

³ Herbert, p. 28.

remained in the archives of the Cockpit and thus passed to the new company. The cast of *The Renegado* is the smallest of the five which are extant for the company,¹ naming only seven men and two boys: John Blaney, John Sumner, Michael Bowyer, William Reignolds, William Allen, William Robbins, Edward Shakerley, Edward Rogers, and Theophilus Bird. The odd thing about this cast is that four of the most important actors of the company, men who appear in all the other casts, are not found here at all—Richard Perkins, William Sherlock, Hugh Clark, and Anthony Turner. Perkins was the actor of greatest repute in the company, Sherlock and Clark were named leaders in 1634;² Turner is very well known. The obvious conclusion is that these men had not yet joined the company, neither an oversight, nor the performance of small unassigned roles, nor the omission of suitable parts from the play can account for the failure of so many prominent actors of the company to appear here. The absence of these four important players is enough to suggest an early date, before 1626, for the cast of *The Renegado*. But there is other evidence in the cast which leads to the same conclusion. Three of the actors in *The Renegado*, John Blaney, Edward Shakerley, and William Reignolds, never appear with the company again. This disappearance suggests that they were replaced by Perkins, Sherlock, and Turner, all of whom have prominent parts in *The Wedding*, the company's next play, in May 1626. The cast of seven men and two boys printed in the 1630 edition of *The Renegado* must, then, represent Queen Henrietta's company as it existed at the end of 1625 or in the first months of 1626 and before it was joined by Perkins, Sherlock, and Turner, who have important roles in *The Wedding* in May 1626 and continue to perform such roles for the company for ten years and more.

There is a more important suggestion in the cast of *The Renegado*, the earliest known list of Queen Henrietta's men. It will be recalled that the new company has generally been called a continuation of Lady Elizabeth's men because of the presence of two prominent members of that company, William Sherlock and Anthony Turner, in the records of Queen Henrietta's players until 1637 and 1641. But neither of these men appeared in the company's performance of

¹ Massinger's *Renegado*, Shirley's *Wedding*, Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*, Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, and Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio*.

² See Appendix, p. 688.

The Renegado in 1625 or 1626, presumably because they had not yet joined the company at that date. If they had not, there is more reason to think of Queen Henrietta's men as an outgrowth of Queen Anne's company than of Lady Elizabeth's, even though the latter had been the most recent occupants of the Cockpit.

None of these suggestions can be pressed very far because the majority of the actors of this company are unknown before 1625. Discovery of the earlier associations of even three or four of the eleven unknowns might completely reverse any conclusions possible now. But such evidence as we have at hand indicates that in 1625 Lady Elizabeth's men left or were forced out of the Cockpit, that Beeston formed a new company, taking more of his men from the former Red Bull players than from any other group, that this new company, represented by the cast for *The Renegado*, soon lost three of its chief actors, Blaney, Reignolds, and Shakerley, and that these three men were replaced by Sherlock and Turner from the old Lady Elizabeth's company and Richard Perkins from the King's men. The cast of *The Wedding* represents the company as it existed in 1626 and substantially as it continued to exist until it was broken in 1636.

If the Queen's company began to play at the Cockpit as soon as the plague restraint of 1625 was removed,¹ they were soon suppressed again, for on 6 December 1625 a special order was issued to 'prohibite the players of the howse at the Cockpitt, beinge next to his Majesties Courte at Whitehall, commaundinge them to surcease all such theire proceedinges untill his Majesties pleasure be further signified'.² The reason given for this action was the conviction that the assembling of crowds was 'a great meanes of spreadinge and continewinge the infeccioun'. Since only six plague deaths were reported in the week ending 15 December,³ it is probable that this special prohibition did not last for long.

Sir Henry Herbert licensed several plays for the new company in the first period of its existence. On 9 February 1625/6 he allowed Shirley's *Maid's Revenge*, probably for the

¹ I am assuming that the company was completely organized during the idle period in 1625 and ready to play when the theatres were allowed to open, probably late in November (see Plague Appendix, pp. 654-7).

² *Middx. Co. Rec.* III. 6.

³ See Appendix, p. 668.

Queen's men,¹ and early in the same year he must also have given them permission to act Shirley's *Wedding*, which was on the stage about the end of May 1626² and which was played by this company.³ On 5 July 1627 Massinger's *Great Duke* was licensed for them,⁴ and on 3 October 1628 Shirley's *Witty Fair One*.⁵

On 19 June 1629 livery allowances were made for fourteen members of the company 'to Christopher Biston for himselfe & thirteene others his fellowes'.⁶ There is a note added to the record of the warrant in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books, 'his Ma^{ties} pleasure was signified by my Lord of Dorsett',⁷ which may indicate that the Queen took some interest in her company, since Dorset had been made Lord Chamberlain to the Queen about a year before.

There is evidence in these years that the new company at the Cockpit was succeeding in attracting the more exclusive audiences of the time—Beeston no doubt made special efforts to take advantage of the proximity of his theatre to the court at Whitehall. The great Duke of Buckingham saw Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece* at this theatre on 6 August 1628,⁸ and there is further evidence of the company's popularity with courtly audiences in the records of its performances at court.

¹ *Herbert*, p. 31. The licence does not give the name of the company, but the title-page of the 1639 quarto says that the play was acted by the Queen's men at the theatre in Drury Lane. But see p. 218, n. 3.

² See Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 40-1.

³ The title-page of the 1629 quarto says that the play was acted 'by her Maesties Seruants'.

⁴ 'The *Great Duke* was licensed for the Queen's Servants, July 5, 1627' (*Herbert*, p. 31). Apparently this play is *The Great Duke of Florence*, which was published in 1636 as acted 'by her Ma^{ties} Servants, at the Phoenix in Drurie Lane'.

⁵ *Herbert*, p. 32. *Herbert* does not name the company, but the title-page of the 1633 quarto says that the play was presented by Queen Henrietta's company.

⁶ The fourteen were probably the eleven adults of the *Wedding* cast and Beeston, Goad, and Axen.

⁷ *M S C.* ii. 350.

⁸ 'On Wenesday his Grace was also spectator of y^e Rape of Lucrece at y^e Cocke-pitt'. Quoted from a newsletter in a private collection printed by George Bullen in *The Athenaeum*, 18 October 1879 (See above, p. 23, n. 1, and the discussion of *Henry VIII* in the repertory of the King's company, pp. 128-9, for a fuller treatment). It is possible that the Cockpit here referred to is the one at court and not Beeston's theatre in Drury Lane, but Beeston's theatre is much the more likely, as there is no record of payment for a court performance at this date, and summer performances at court were quite rare, furthermore, it seems highly improbable that if this play had been performed at court Heywood and the publishers would have neglected to mention the fact on the title-page of the 1630 or the 1638 edition.

In July 1630 an unnamed payee (probably Beeston) was given £100 for ten plays which the Queen's men had presented at court from October 1629 to February 1629/30.¹ In this same period the King's men presented no more than twelve plays at court,² and there is no record of performances by any other company. It is pretty certain that actors who were in demand at court and whose theatre was graced by the patronage of the Duke of Buckingham had their share of success with the general public.

Further evidence of the popularity of the company is to be found in Thomas Carew's verses prefixed to the 1630 quarto of Davenant's *Just Italian*, which was acted with ill success by the King's company.³

He not misspend in prayse, the narrow roome
 I borrow in this leafe; the Garlands bloome
 From thine owne seedes, that crowne each glorious page
 Of thy triumphant worke; the sullen Age
 Requires a Satyre. What starre guides the soule [5]
 Of these our froward times, that dare controule,
 Yet dare not learne to iudge? When didst thou flie
 From hence, cleare, candid Ingenuity?
 I haue beheld, when pearchd on the smooth brow
 Of a fayre modest troope, thou didst allow [10]
 Applause to slighter workes; but then the weake
 Spectator, gaue the knowing leaue to speake.
 Now noyse preuayles, and he is taxd for drowth
 Of wit, that with the crie, spends not his mouth.
 Yet aske him, reason why he did not like; [15]
 Him, why he did, their ignorance will strike
 Thy soule with scorne, and Pity. marke the places
 Prouoke their smiles, frownes, or distorted faces,
 When, they admire, nod, shake the head: they'le be
 A scene of myrth, a double Comedie. [20]
 But thy strong fancies (raptures of the brayne,
 Drest in Poetique flames) they entertayne
 As a bold, impious reach; for they'l still slight
 All that exceeds Red Bull, and Cockepit flight.
 These are the men in crowded heapes that throng [25]
 To that adulterate stage, where not a tong
 Of th'untun'd Kennell, can a line repeat
 Of serious sense: but like lips, meet like meat;
 Whilst the true brood of Actors, that alone
 Keepe naturall vnstrayn'd Action in her throne [30]

¹ See *M.S.C.* II. 352.

² See above, p. 96.

³ Herbert licensed this play 2 October 1629 (*Herbert*, p. 32).

Behold their Benches bare, though they rehearse
 The tearser *Beaumonts* or great *Johnsons* verse.
 Repine not Thou then, since this churlish fate
 Rules not the stage alone, perhaps the State
 Hath felt this rancour, where men great and good, [35]
 Haue by the Rabble beene misunderstood.
 So was thy Play, whose cleere, yet lofty strayne,
 Wisemen, that gouerne Fate, shall entertayne.

The author of these verses is comparing in lines 23-32 the empty benches to which the King's men played—for it was the King's men who had presented this particular play and whose repertory was distinguished by plays of Beaumont and Jonson—with the crowds at the Cockpit and Red Bull.¹ It must be borne in mind that Carew's sneers had been provoked by the poor reception of Davenant's play, and so the bare benches at the Blackfriars cannot be taken too literally or as an indication of a chronic condition. However, the whole taunt would be pointless if it were not true that the companies at the Cockpit and Red Bull were playing to full houses at this time.²

This period of prosperity was brought to a close—as so often was the case with the players—by a long period of plague-enforced idleness. On 17 April 1630 the Master of the Revels sent his messenger to the playhouses and the Bear-garden ordering them to close. The prohibition lasted for

¹ This coupling of the two theatres (though it may well be just an attempt to belittle the Cockpit by associating it with the notoriously vulgar Red Bull) is perhaps a slight support for the notion mentioned above, pp. 163 and 202-3, that Beeston was connected with both the Red Bull and the Cockpit at this time. One wonders if it is possible that his companies ever used these theatres as an indoor and an outdoor house, as the King's men used the Globe and Blackfriars.

² It must be pointed out, however, that in spite of the keen competition which the Queen's men seem to have been giving the King's company, Blackfriars was still thought of as the premier theatre. Francis Lupton probably only exaggerates the popular estimate when he says of the young Inns of Court man who has just come into his fortune (*The Young Gallant's Whirligig*, 1629, p. 13):

The Cockpit heretofore would serue his wit,
 But now vpon the Fryers stage hee'll sit,
 It must be so, though this expansive foole
 Should pay an angell for a paltry stoole.

All these verses suggest strenuous competition between the companies in 1630. The lines which Lupton wrote in his character of 'Play-houses' about this time seem quite apt: 'they [the players] say, as Schollers now vse to say, there are so many, that one Fox could nnd in his heart to eate his fellow' (D Lupton, *London and the Countrey Carbonadoed*, 1632, HN 8^{vo}, pp. 80-1).

seven months, for the theatres were not permitted to reopen until the 12th of November.¹

We have no evidence as to how the members of the company supported themselves during this time. There are no records of them in the provinces and no records of special allowances like those made to the King's men in the plague years of 1603, 1609, 1625, 1630, and 1636.² Though the company presented sixteen plays at court from 10 October 1630 to 20 February 1630/1, they were not paid until 25 May 1631, when Beeston received £170.³

On 20 November 1630, a week after the theatres had opened, William Allen received an order for the delivery of liveries to himself and thirteen others of the Queen's players.⁴ Only the players of the King and of Queen Henrietta were receiving royal liveries in these years.

There is other evidence that these two companies of the Globe and the Phoenix were popularly considered the ranking troupes of the day. The prologue to *Holland's Leaguer*, presented at the Salisbury Court in December 1631,⁵ says:

... though on each hand
To over-top us, two great Lawrels stand,
The one, when she shall please to spread her traine,
The vastnesse of the Globe cannot containe,
Th'other so high, the Phoenix does aspire
To build in, and takes new life from the fire
Bright Poesie creates . . .⁶

It seems likely that the high repute of Queen Henrietta's company was due in part to the plays which James Shirley was writing for them. Between their opening at the Phoenix after the plague of 1625 and their departure during the long plague closing of 1636-7, the Queen's men are known to have produced twenty plays written in whole or in part by Shirley.⁷

¹ See Appendix, pp. 657-8.

³ See *M.S.C.* ii. 355

⁵ Herbert, p. 45.

² See above, p. 20 and n. 6.

⁴ *M.S.C.* ii. 352-3.

⁶ 1632 quarto Chi

⁷ *Love Tricks* or *The School of Compliment*, *The Maid's Revenge*, *The Wedding*, *The Witty Fair One*, *The Faithful Servant* or *The Grateful Servant*, *The Traitor*, *The Duke* or *The Humorous Courtier*, *Love's Cruelty*, *Hyde Park*, *The Ball*, *The Arcadia*, *The Beauties* or *The Bird in a Cage*, *The Young Admiral*, *The Gamester*, *The Example*, *The Opportunity*, *The Coronation*, *Chabot*, *Admiral of France*, *The Lady of Pleasure*, and *The Duke's Mistress*. All these plays appear to have been written for the company, except the first, which was licensed 11 February 1624/5, before Queen Henrietta's troupe was organized. It was licensed for the Cockpit company and probably performed by Lady Elizabeth's men before they left that theatre, but it was later acted by Queen Henrietta's men, as the title-page of the 1631 edition

Only one of the plays which Shirley is known to have written in these years was acted by another company, *Changes, or Love in a Maze*, which was licensed 10 January 1631/2 and published almost immediately as acted by 'the Company of His Majesties Revels'.¹ Evidently for a number of years Shirley was under contract to the company or the manager of the Phoenix, as Richard Brome is known to have been at Salisbury Court.² One might hazard the guess that his contract called for two plays a year,³ for two of his unassisted plays (i.e. not revisions or collaborations) were licensed in each of the years 1626, 1632, 1634, and 1635, and the three plays of 1631 are probably accounted for by the fact that Shirley had a play left over from the plague year of 1630 when no plays were licensed. In 1633 three unassisted plays were licensed, in 1628, 1629, and 1636, one, and in 1627 and 1630, none. The small total in 1636 is obviously due to the eight months' plague closing of that year, as is the absence of licenses for 1630, a year in which there is no record of a licence to any company. I cannot account for the figures in 1627, 1628, and 1629. Perhaps some of Shirley's plays of these years are lost; it is even more likely that others of uncertain date, like *The Constant Maid* and *The Arcadia*, were written in this time.

Whatever the nature of Shirley's agreement with the players at the Phoenix it is evident that he was writing regularly for them in these years and that he was associated with the company as no other playwright is known to have been.

Sometime in 1632 the Queen's men acted Nabbe's *Covent Garden*, as we learn from the title-page of the 1638 quarto: 'Acted in the Yeare, MDCXXXII. By the Queenes Majesties Servants'. A few lines of this play leave the impression that the company fancied themselves not a little. In Act I,

shows (See below, pp. 256-9) *The Night Walkers*, 'a play of Fletchers corrected by Sherley' and relicensed by Herbert 11 May 1633 (see *Herbert*, p. 34), might be added to this list, but Shirley's part in it seems to be slight.

¹ But see below, pp. 305-7. It may be that Shirley intended to continue working for the Salisbury Court instead of the Phoenix. See the prologue and epilogue to *Changes*, both repeated in his *Poems*, 1646.

² See below, p. 295. A contractual association with the Queen's company is also suggested by the title-page of *The Bird in a Cage*, which says, 'The Author Iames Shirley, Servant to Her Majesty'. (See 'Players'.)

³ The licence dates suggest that Shirley intended to deliver an autumn play and a late winter or spring play. In the years of more than one unassisted play the licences fall: 1626, February, November, 1631, May (two), November; 1632, April, November, 1633, January, July, November; 1634, June, November; 1635, February, October.

scene 1, Dobson and Ralph, new come to town from the country, are talking in Covent Garden.

Dobs. Dost thinke we shall dwell hereabouts?

Ralph I hope so: we shall then be neere the *Cock-pit*, and see a Play now and then ¹

Dobs But tell me *Ralph*, are those Players the ragged fellows that were at our house last *Christmas* that borrowed the red blanket off my bed to make their Major a gowne; and had the Great Pot-lid for *Guy of Warwicks* Buckler?

Ralph. No, *Dobson*, they are men of credit, whose actions are beheld by every one, and allow'd for the most part with commendations. They make no yearly Progresse with the *Anatomy* of a Sumpter-horse, laden with the sweepings of *Long-lane* in a dead Vacation, and purchas'd at the exchange of their owne whole Wardrobes. They buy not their Ordinary for the Copie of a *Prologue*, nor insinuate themselves into the acquaintance of an admiring *Nigle*, who for his free comming in, is at the expence of a Taverne Supper, and rinses their bawling throats with Canarye.

Ralph's boast that the Queen's men made no yearly progress is confirmed by the paucity of provincial records of the company, yet the passage has a very smug sound. One is at once reminded of the sneers at the Cockpit and Red Bull in *The Just Italian*.² Both Ralph's boasts and Carew's sneers carry the implication that the company at the Cockpit was of increasing importance in London.

There is a hint in one of the records of the company in this year, 1632, that the growing prestige of Queen Henrietta's men was due in no small measure to the astuteness of Christopher Beeston. On 16 November 1632 Sir Henry Herbert licensed Shirley's play, *The Ball*, for the company,³ but there must have been complaints against it, for two days later the following entry is found in his office-book:

18 Nov. 1632. In the play of *The Ball*, written by Sherley, and acted by the Queens players, ther were divers personated so

¹ An interesting commentary on the growing importance of the environs of the Cockpit theatre and on the character of the district is furnished by a letter of 8 June 1623 from the Privy Council to the Justices of the Peace of Middlesex (*M.S.C.* 1. 383).

'Wheras the high way leading a long the backside of the Cockpitt play-house neere Lincolnes Inne Feilds, and the streete called Queenes streete adioyning to the same, are become verie fowle and almost impassable, And for that the said high way by reason of the new buildings, now erecting there, is become a streete, through w^{ch}: his ma^{tie}: and o^r: selues and divers of his Subjects doe often passe And therefore it is verie necessarie & fitt that the same should be paved wth stones, as other Streetes are. . . .'

² See above, pp. 224-5.

³ Herbert, p. 34.

naturally, both of lords and others of the court, that I took it ill, and would have forbidden the play, but that Biston promiste many things which I found faulte withall should be left out, and that he would not suffer it to be done by the poet any more, who deserves to be punisht, and the first that offends in this kind, of poets or players, shall be sure of publique punishment.¹

It was not every manager who could so soothe away the indignation of the Master of the Revels and promise his company back into favour. And when Herbert is found only seven months later writing a hearty commendation of Shirley in a fashion quite unique in the office-book,² one is inclined to suspect that Beeston had been at work again.³

It was Beeston who was paid, about a fortnight later on 5 December 1632, for nine plays which had been given by the company at court 'in October &c. 1631'.⁴ Probably most of these plays were given during the Christmas season of 1631-2, though it was rather unusual for payment to be so long delayed. Indeed, the company had probably begun performing plays for the court season of 1632-3 before they were paid for that of 1631-2, for on 27 October 1633 they were paid £240 for fourteen plays acted at court.⁵

On 5 December 1632, the same day that Beeston was paid for court performances of 1631-2, bastard scarlet and velvet were granted to fourteen members of the company 'for their Lueryes allowed euery second yeere & due at Michmas last. 1632'.⁶ The number of Queen's men granted livery is the same as that found in all allowances for the company and the same as the number of King's men who were granted livery 1627-35.

In the ten months period beginning with May 1633 an unusually large number of the activities of Queen Henrietta's players is recorded in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book

1633, May 7. 'R. for allowmge of *The Tale of the Tubb*, Vitru Hoop's parte wholly strucke out, and the motion of the tubb, by commande from my lorde chamberln; exceptions being taken against it by Inigo Jones, surveyor of the kings workes, as a personal injury unto him. May 7, 1633,—2l. o. o.'⁷

1633, May 11. 'For a play of *Fletchers* corrected by Sherley

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

² See below, p. 230.

³ Beeston's way with the Master of the Revels is also to be seen in the undated note in the office-book. 'Meetinge with him [Beeston, the manager of the Cockpit Playhouse] at the ould exchange, he gave my wife a payre of gloves, that cost him at least twenty shillings' (*Herbert*, p. 67).

⁴ *M.S.C.* ii. 359.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 354

⁷ *Herbert*, p. 34. See the entry of 14 January 1633/4 below.

called *The Night Walkers*, the 11 May, 1633.—£2 0 0 For the queen's players'¹

1633, July 3 'The comedy called *The Yonge Admirall*, being free from oaths, prophaness, or obsceanes, hath given mee much delight and satisfaction in the readinge, and may serve for a patterne to other poetts, not only for the bettring of maners and language, but for the improvement of the quality, which hath received some brushings of late

'When Mr Sherley hath read this approbation, I know it will encourage him to pursue this beneficial and cleanly way of poetry, and when other poetts heare and see his good success, I am confident they will imitate the original for their own credit, and make such copies in this harmless way, as shall speak them masters in their art, at the first sight, to all judicious spectators It may be acted this 3 July, 1633

'I have entered this allowance, for direction to my successor, and for example to all poetts, that shall write after the date hereof'²

1633, Aug. 15 'Received of Biston, for an ould play called *Hymen's Holliday*, newly revived at their house, being a play given unto him for my use, this 15 Aug 1633, 3*l* 0 0 Received of him for some alterations in it 1*l* 0. 0'³

1633, Nov. 11. *The Gamester*, by James Shirley, licensed⁴

1633, Nov. 19. 'On tuesday, the 19th of November, being the king's birth-day, *The Yong Admirall* was acted at St James by the queen's players, and likt by the K and Queen'⁵

1633, Dec. 16. 'On Monday night the 16 of December, 1633, at Whitehall was acted before the King and Queen, *Hymens Holliday or Cupids Fegarys*, an ould play of Rowleys. Likte.'⁶

1633-4, Jan 14 '*The Tale of the Tub* was acted on tuesday night at Court, the 14 Janua 1633, by the Queenes players, and not likte.'⁷

1633-4, Jan 30 '*The Night-Walkers* was acted on thursday night the 30 Janua. 1633, at Court, before the King and Queen Likte as a merry play. Made by Fletcher'⁸

1633-4, Feb 6. 'On thursday night the 6 of Febru. 1633, *The Gamester* was acted at Court, made by Sherley, out of a plot of the king's, given him by mee, and well likte The king sayd it was the best play he had seen for seven years.'⁹

¹ *Herbert*, p 34

² *Ibid*, pp 19-20 See the entry of 19 November below Evidently after their difficulties with *The Ball*, Beeston and Shirley had learned something about the way to handle the Master of the Revels

³ *Ibid*, p 35

⁴ *Ibid* See below, 6 February 1633/4. The title-page of the 1637 quarto says that the play was acted by the Queen's company.

⁵ *Ibid*, p 53.

⁶ *Ibid* See the entry of 15 August above.

⁷ *Ibid*, p 54.

⁸ *Ibid* See the entry of 11 May 1633 above

⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 54-5. The title-page of the 1637 quarto says that the play was presented by Queen Henrietta's men.

Not all patrons of the Queen's company approved of their plays as heartily as the King approved of Shirley's *Gamester*. There is a rather amusing record of their failure to please at least one member of their audience in the diary of Sir Humphrey Mildmay. Sir Humphrey went to the Cockpit on 20 March 1633/4, and both his accounts and his diary record his disapproval of the play. 'To a base play att the Cocke pitt eod—oo—or—o6'. And in the diary, 'this after noone J wente to the Cocke pitt to a playe wth Bor Anth: a fooleishe one .¹

Later in the year 1634 we have a note on Queen Henrietta's company by a humble functionary of one of the rival London troupes, Richard Kendall, wardrobe keeper for the company of the King's Revels, playing at the Salisbury Court. In July 1634, while this company was playing at one of the Oxford inns, Kendall visited Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of Queen's College. Crosfield kept notes of his conversation with his visitor from the London theatre and recorded them in his diary, under date of 18 July 1634. Part of Kendall's conversation concerned 'the severall Companies of Players in London w^{ch} are in number 5'. The first company was, of course, the King's men of Blackfriars. The second was,

- 2 The Queen's servants at y^e Phoenix in Drury Lane. Their master Mi Beeston, Mr Boyer, Shirley Robinson, Clarke—²

Unfortunately Crosfield's notes are not quite so clear as they might be. Kendall certainly meant that Beeston was master of the company, not that all five men were. Furthermore, the selection of leading members of the company is a bit odd. The members who appeared in all other lists from *The Wedding* in 1626 to *Hannibal and Scipio* in 1635 are Richard Perkins, Michael Bowyer, John Sumner, William Sherlock, Anthony Turner, and William Allen;³ court payments were made to Beeston or Allen. It is curious that Kendall should have omitted from his list Richard Perkins, the leading actor of the company, William Allen, Beeston's deputy on occasion, John Sumner, and Anthony Turner and included William Robbins or Robinson, who does not appear

¹ See Appendix, p. 676. Sir Humphrey did not always feel so disdainful about the plays which he saw Queen Henrietta's men perform. Some nine months before, on 6 June 1633, he had recorded the expenditure of a shilling to see 'a pretty & Merry Conedy att the Cocke', and twenty months later he called *The Lady of Pleasure* 'that rare playe'.

² See Appendix, p. 688.

³ See below, p. 246.

in so many casts as the omitted players, and Hugh Clark, first a boy actor and more recently an actor of secondary roles.¹ I am taking it for granted that in Crosfield's list Shirley stands for Sherlock, though it is possible that Kendall was referring to the dramatist, whose close relation to the company has been noted.² It may be that Kendall was not very well acquainted with Queen Henrietta's men, or, as seems more likely, that after mentioning the master of the company he went on to talk of various actors, of whom Crosfield remembered only Bowyer, Sherlock, Robbins, and Clark.

It was apparently later in 1634 that the Queen's men achieved a great success before the King and Queen with Heywood's masque, *Love's Mistress*. The title-page of the 1636 edition of the piece boasts that it was 'three times presented before their two Excellent MAESTIES, within the space of eight dayes', and Mr. Clark sets forth good reasons for believing that these performances were in November 1634.³ The first of the three performances before royalty seems to have been at the Phoenix, and Mr. Clark conjectures that it was in the nature of a dress rehearsal.⁴ Heywood's prologue refers to the presence of the unusual visitors at this first performance.

The *Prologue* to this Play, the first time it was Presented on the Stage; *Cupid* descending in a Cloud, the Speaker

It was a Custome 'mongst the *Romanes*, when
State-Ladies they invited, or great men,
As if their doores were all too base, and vile
To entertaine them, their large Roofes to untile,
And their unbounded welcome more to crowne,
In Artificiall Cloudes to let them downe;
Their superstitious Love so farre extending,
Receiving them as gods from heaven descending
Although we cannot meet you with like state,
As entring hither at our publike gate,
You are as welcome; ⁵

The second performance was the one which the Queen gave for the King on his birthday at Denmark House, as the title for Heywood's second prologue indicates:

Her Majesty inviting the King to *Denmark House*, in the Strand, upon His Birth-day, being *November* the 19. This Play (bearing from that time) the Title of the *Queens Masque*, was againe presented before Him:⁵

¹ See 'Players'.

³ Clark, *Heywood*, pp. 129-42.

⁵ 1640 edition Chi.

² See above, pp. 226-7.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 130-1.

It was evidently this second production for which Inigo Jones devised the sets that so delighted Heywood. Heywood says in his address to the reader.

*So much for the Subject it selfe, but for the rare decorements which new apparrell'd it, when it came the second time to the Royall view, (Her Gracious Majesty then entertaining His Highnesse at Denmarke-house, upon his Birth-day) I cannot pretermitt to give a due Charracter to that admirable Artist, Mr Inego Jones, Master surveyor of the Kings worke, &c. Who to every Act, nay almost to every Sceane, by his excellent Inventions, gave such an extraordinary Luster; upon every occasion changing the stage, to the admiration of all the Spectators: that, as I must Ingeniously confesse, It was above my apprehension to conceive, so to their sacred Majesties, and the rest of the Auditory*¹

The success of the second showing was evidently so great that another performance at court was arranged, the second at court, but the third before the King and Queen. For this performance Heywood wrote a third prologue:

The *Prologue* To the King and Queene, the Second time it was Acted, the same Weeke Spoken by *Cupid*

Yes, sure 'twas heere where some few houers I past,
The very time that I descended last,
I, heere it was, I know it by one face,
To which my Mistris *Psobe* [*Psyche*] must give place.
A Presence, that from *Venus* takes all power,
And makes each place shee comes in, *Cupids* bower²

Heywood's ingenuous delight at the success of his play probably did not surpass that of the actors of the Queen's company, who had attained with it a distinction generally reserved for the more famous King's men.

The company performed at court on five other occasions in this year, for in March 1635/6 Christopher Beeston was paid for eight plays performed at court in 1634.³ Beeston was also payee when the regular biennial livery allowance was made for fourteen members of the company, 16 December 1634.⁴

In February 1634/5 a distinguished troupe of French players came to England, and, as one might expect, attained high favour at court where the French influence was so strong in these years. The first notice of the presence of the Frenchmen is found in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book:

'On tuesday night the 17 of February, 1634, [1634-5,] a Frenche company of players, being approved of by the queene

¹ 1640 ed. Chit. ² 1636 ed. HN ³ M.S.C. u. 378. ⁴ Ibid., p. 374.

at her house too nights before, and commended by her majesty to the kinge, were admtted to the Cockpitt in Whitehall, and there presented the king and queene with a Frenche comedy called *Melise*, with good approbation for which play the king gives them ten pounds'¹

Evidently the French company sought the plaudits of the populace as well as the court, and their visit was well timed for a satisfaction of this desire. They had arrived during Lent, when the acting days of the London companies were limited,² and they had the opportunity of using the vacant theatres of London troupes. They were given the playhouse of Queen Henrietta's men for at least part of their performances, as we learn from Sir Henry Herbert:

'This day being Friday, and the 20 of the same monthe, the kinge tould mee his pleasure, and commanded mee to give order that this Frenche company should playe the too sermon daies in the weeke, during their time of playinge in Lent, and in the house of Drury-lane, where the queenes players usually playe

'The kings pleasure I signified to Mr Beeston, the same day, who obeyd readily.

'The house-keepers are to give them by promise the benefit of their interest for the two days of the first weeke'³

Sir Henry's further entries show that the French company did a good business in London, but his records do not make quite clear just how long they stayed at the Phoenix. He says:

'They had the benefitt of playinge on the sermon daies, and gott two hundred pounds at least, besides many rich clothes were given them.

'They had freely to themselves the whole weeke before the weeke before Easter, which I obtaynd of the king for them'⁴

Probably the Queen's men resumed full-time playing at their theatre after Easter (29 March); if so, the Frenchmen played at the Phoenix about fourteen days. It seems highly improbable that they received 'many rich clothes' from their Phoenix audience, as Herbert's sentence seems to imply.

¹ *Herbert*, p. 60.

² See Appendix, p. 654, n. 2

³ *Herbert*, pp. 60-1. One would like to know why the Cockpit was chosen. Was it best suited to the needs of the French players, or did the Queen offer her compatriots the theatre of her own company? Probably its proximity to the court had something to do with the choice. In any case the selection of the Cockpit at the King's command shows that this theatre was thought of as at least one of the best in London.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

Probably the clothes were given them for court performances, of which there were several.¹

After they left the Phoenix the French players acted for a time on a special stage erected in the riding-school of M. le Febure in Drury Lane. A warrant for the erection of a stage, scaffolds, and seats in this riding academy was issued 18 April 1635, and less than three weeks later, on 5 May, a warrant was issued to the company allowing them to act in this new playing place 'during pleasure'.² The company was evidently still in London in December 1635, for on 8 January 1635/6 a warrant was issued to Josias Floridor in payment for a play acted at court in that month.³ Presumably the Frenchmen returned to Paris shortly thereafter, no doubt to the great relief of their English competitors.

Our only records of the activities of Queen Henrietta's men during the year of the French players' visit to London concern the plays produced by them at their theatre and at court. Probably it was some time in May that they performed Chapman and Shirley's *Chabot, Admiral of France*, for Sir Henry Herbert licensed the play 29 April 1635.⁴ Later in the year, on 15 October, Herbert licensed *The Lady of Pleasure*,⁵ and it was soon on the stage, for John Greene saw it at the Cockpit on 6 November 1635.⁶ At least one member of the Phoenix audience was enthusiastic about this play. Sir Humphrey Mildmay wrote in his diary on 8 December 1635, 'wente to the La: of pleasure & sawe that rare playe'.⁷

Some time in 1635 Queen Henrietta's men produced Nabbes's play, *Hannibal and Scipio*, for the 1637 quarto of the play says, 'Acted in the yeare 1635. by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at their Private house in Drury Lane'. This play

¹ On 10 May 1635 Josias Floridor was paid £30 'for three playes Acted by them at y^e Cockpitt', evidently the Cockpit at court and not the Phoenix. He was paid again on 8 January 1635/6 for 'A Tragedy by them Acted before his Maty^e in December last' (*M.S.C.* ii 376 and 378). Two of these plays must have been *Le Trompeur Pun*, acted at court 30 March 1635, and *Alcedon*, acted 15 April 1635. See *Herbert*, p. 61 and nn. 4, 5, 7, and 8.

² See *M.S.C.* ii 375, *Herbert*, p. 61, and Adams, pp. 420-4.

³ *M.S.C.* ii. 378.

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 36. The licence entry does not name the company, but the title-page of the 1639 quarto does.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 37. Again the company name is omitted. It appears on the title-page of the 1637 quarto.

⁶ Symonds, 'Diary', p. 389.

⁷ See Appendix, p. 677.

is one of several which were published with a cast of the Queen's men who took part in the performance.¹

In the course of the year the company produced nine plays at court, for Christopher Beeston was paid for them on 10 May 1637.² We know the names and dates of only two, however. Sir Henry Herbert records in his office-book, '*The Dukes Mistres* played at St. James the 22 of Feb. 1635[36]. Made by Sherley',³ and 'The 28 Feb. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, playd by the Q. men at St. James'.⁴

There is a record of one more play licence for this company, and then its career at the Cockpit comes to an end. Mr. W. J. Lawrence has found on the fly-leaf of Malone's copy of *The Hollander*⁵ the following extract from Herbert's office-book:

For the Queen's Company. For a new play called *Love's Tryall*, or *the Hollander* this 12 March 1635[36] . . . £2 0 0.⁶

Two months after the licence of *The Hollander* came the order to close the theatres. Herbert's record of this and the subsequent events is the most reliable source of our knowledge of the break-up of Queen Henrietta's company at the Phoenix in Drury Lane. These entries are as follows:

'At the increase of the plague to 4 within the citty and 54 in all.⁷—This day the 12 May, 1636, I received a warrant from my lord Chamberlin for the suppressing of playes and shews, and at the same time delivered my severall warrants to George Wilson for the four companys of players, to be served upon them'⁸

¹ See below, p. 246.

² M.S.C. ii 383.

³ *Herbert*, p. 56. The play had been licensed a month before on 18 January (*ibid.*, p. 37). Neither of Herbert's entries names the company, but the title-page of the 1638 quarto does.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁵ See his article, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923.

⁶ The title-page of the 1640 quarto of this play says, 'A Comedy written 1635 . . . And now Printed as it was then Acted at the Cock-pit in Drury lane, by their Majesties Servants, with good allowance', but there is obviously a mistake here, as the company of Their Majesties' servants was not formed before the middle of 1636, at the earliest. The mistake may be due to the fact that Their Majesties' servants were probably using this play at the time of the publication of the first quarto. It is just possible that though the play was licensed to the Queen's men, they did not get to act it, since the theatres were closed two months after it was licensed.

⁷ Fleay thought that the '4' in this sentence was a mistake for '41'. As a matter of fact, when the Privy Council sent out its order on the 10th, the last report of plague deaths—that of 5 May—had recorded four. But on the day that Sir Henry Herbert sent out his order—12 May—forty-one deaths were reported. See Appendix, p. 669.

⁸ *Herbert*, p. 65. Though Sir Henry Herbert sent out his warrants on the 12th, the Privy Council order for the closing of the theatres had been

'On thursday morning the 23 of February the bill of the plague made the number at forty foure, upon which decrease the king gave the players their liberty, and they began the 24 February 1636. [1636-7]

'The plague encreasinge, the players laye still' untill the 2 of October, when they had leave to play

'Mr. Beeston was commanded to make a company of boyes, and began to play at the Cockpit with them the same day.

'I disposed of Perkins, Sumner, Sherlock and Turner, to Salisbury Court, and joynd them with the best of that company.'²

It seems pretty certain that Queen Henrietta's company was deliberately broken by Christopher Beeston. Great though the drain of the long plague closing must have been, the prosperity of the organization before the plague seems solid enough to have carried it through. Furthermore, the earlier records of the company seem to indicate that the financial responsibility for the Queen's men was chiefly Beeston's. He owned the theatre, and it is possible that he owned the plays, and Beeston himself seems to have been solvent after the plague. Most of the actors of the company survived the epidemic and appear later in other and sometimes inferior companies. Herbert's note that Beeston was commanded to make up a new company does not suggest the desperate expedients of bankrupt men. It seems a likely conjecture that Beeston simply saw an opportunity for profit for himself and got rid of one company in order to form another.

Herbert's notes and the subsequent records of the new company at the Cockpit are quite sufficient to show that the Queen's men were forced out of that theatre. Evidently the old company did not transfer to a new theatre but was broken and later reconstituted at Salisbury Court. Such a sequence of events is related by Richard Heton, manager of the Salisbury Court theatre, in the notes which he made for a new

issued two days before, on the 10th (*M.S.C.* i 391). For some reason the Privy Council issued two separate orders, one 'that the Lo Chamblaine of the Queens ma^{ty} Household, should be hereby prayed & required to cause the Players, that are her ma^{ty}s: Servants to forbear all Stage Playes & other Enterludes whatsoever vntill further order', and the other 'that the Lo Chamblaine of his ma^{ty}s Household should be hereby prayed & required to cause all Stage Playes, Enterludes, Showes & Spectacles whatsoever, to be forthwith suppressed vntill further order'.

¹ The Privy Council ordered the theatres closed again on 1 March 1636/7, one week after they had been opened. See Appendix, p. 662.

² *Herbert*, pp. 65-6.

patent for the new Queen Henrietta's company in the spring of 1639. Heton says,

When her M^{ts} servants were at the Cockpitt, beinge all at liberty, they disperst themselves to severall Companies, soe that had not my lo of Dorsett taken care to make up a new Company for the Queene, she had not had any at all ¹

Though Heton's notes, supplemented by Sir Henry Herbert's statement and our knowledge of the number of old Queen Henrietta's men who remained with Beeston at the Cockpit as part of the new boys' company,² make the general course of events clear enough, they do not help much with the dates. When did the old Queen Henrietta's company break, and when was the new one formed?

The old group must have broken at least several weeks before 7 February 1636/7, for on that date the new company at the Cockpit, Beeston's Boys, presented a play at court,³ and it surely took several weeks to form and rehearse the new company. A further suggestion that the old company had broken up by the end of the year 1636 is to be seen in the absence of any livery allowance for them in that year. Their allowance was due every even year at Michaelmas and was generally paid within three or four months of the date it fell due.⁴ The absence of any livery warrant for a Queen Henrietta's company between 16 December 1634 and 20 December 1638 suggests that the company had gone to pieces before or not long after Michaelmas, 1636.

Now Sir Henry Herbert's statement, 'I disposed of Perkins, Sumner, Sherlock and Turner, to Salisbury Court, and joynd them with the best of that company', and the statement in Heton's notes, 'had not my lo: of Dorsett taken care to make up a new Company for the Queene, she had not had any at all', make it apparent that the Queen Henrietta's company which performed at the Salisbury Court 1637-42 was not the Queen Henrietta's company which performed at the Cockpit 1626-36. We even have some verification of Heton's statement, 'When her M^{ts} servants were at the Cockpitt, beinge all at liberty, they disperst themselves to severall Companies', in our knowledge that three old Queen Henrietta's men, Beeston, Fenn, and Bird, were connected with the King and Queen's young company at the Cockpit by May 1637, and

¹ See Appendix, p. 684.

³ See below, p. 325.

² See below.

⁴ See below, p. 247.

two others, Robert Axen and John Page, by 10 August 1639.¹ All these men were probably with Beeston's new company from its beginning. We know further that five old Queen Henrietta's men joined the King's company, and it seems probable that four of them, Michael Bowyer, William Allen, William Robbins, and Hugh Clark, joined at this time.² At least half Queen Henrietta's old company, therefore, appear to have deserted the old organization before Herbert, Heton, and the Earl of Dorset formed the new troupe at the Salisbury Court.

We can conclude with some confidence, now, that the old Queen Henrietta's company broke up during the plague of 1636-7, possibly before Michaelmas, 1636, probably at least by the end of that year. Certain members stayed with Beeston's new company at the Cockpit; others went to the King's company.

How and when was the new Queen Henrietta's company which performed at the Salisbury Court 1637-42 formed? Both Sir Henry Herbert's statement and Heton's indicate that certain officials were more active in the formation of the new company than the players were. It may be noted that neither the Master of the Revels nor the Earl of Dorset, who was the Queen's Lord Chamberlain, was thinking exclusively of the Queen's service when he assisted at the birth of the new company. The Earl of Dorset owned the ground rents for the theatre in which the troupe was to play, and the Master of the Revels also had a financial interest in the playhouse.³ The statements in Sir Henry's office-book and in

¹ See below, pp. 326-7 and 331-2

² See above, pp. 56-7.

³ The precise nature of Sir Henry's interest in the Salisbury Court theatre is not quite clear. Sir George Gresley wrote to Sir Thomas Puckering, 24 October 1629, 'My Lord of Dorset is become a great husband, for the rest of his stables and outhouses towards the water side, he hath let for £1000 fine and £100 by the year rent, unto the master of the revels, to make a playhouse for the children of the revels' (Birch, *Charles I*, II, 35). It may well be that Gresley confused the Master of the Revels and the Deputy Master, William Blagrave, who is known to have been one of the builders of the theatre.

Malone said in referring to the run of *Holland's Leaguer* at the Salisbury Court in 1631, 'and yet Sir Henry Herbert received on account of the six representations but one pound nineteen shillings, in virtue of the ninth share which he possessed as one of the proprietors of that house' (*Variorum*, III, 178). Professor Adams thinks that Malone was confused, and that Sir Henry received one-ninth of the profits at the theatre not as a proprietor's share but as the regular fee to the Master of the Revels which the companies paid in different ways (Adams, p. 374). In any case it is obvious that Sir Henry had a financial interest in the prosperity of the occupants of the Salisbury Court.

Heton's notes for his patent indicate that Herbert strengthened the old Revels troupe at the Salisbury Court by joining four former Queen Henrietta's players to them, and that Dorset did his bit to establish a profitable organization by securing the patronage of the Queen for the new troupe.

The date of the formation of this new Queen Henrietta's company cannot be fixed precisely, but it is evident that they had been organized during the period of plague closing and were eager to open before the plague ban had been removed. On 24 September 1637, more than a week before the theatres were allowed to open, the following notice is found in the Privy Council Registers:

Whereas her Ma^{ty}s Players did by their humble Peti^{on} shew, that by reason of the Infec^{on} of the Plague in and neare about London they have for a long time, almost to their vtter vndoing (having noe other Employment nor meanes to maintaine themselves and their families) been restrayned from vsing their quality, And therefore humbly besought their Lo^{pp}s to bee restored to their former Liberty. It was therevpon Ordered (his Ma^{ty}s: present in Councell) that her Ma^{tes} said Players should bee at liberty to play at Michaelmas next, if by that time there bee noe considerable encrease nor that there dye not of the Infec^{on} in and about London, more then there died this last weeke¹

Obviously the new company was formed and had already secured the patronage of the Queen by 24 September 1637.

There is another piece of evidence to show that the Queen's men began to play at the Salisbury Court when the theatres were allowed to reopen, 2 October 1637. Richard Heton, manager of the theatre, in his 'Instructions' (which can be dated March or April 1639, from their reference to 'one that hath gott a grant from the King, for the building of a new playhouse w^{ch} was intended to be in Fleet Street'),² asks that the patent for electing 'her M^{ty}s Company of Comedians' be granted only to himself, since otherwise the Queen's men might leave the Salisbury Court 'as in one yeare and halfe of their being here they haue many tymes threatned'. At

¹ *M.S.C.* i. 393-4, from Privy Council Registers, Charles I, xiv. 222. The granting of this petition was no very great concession, since the last five weekly reports had all indicated that the plague deaths were below the generally accepted danger mark of forty. The last weekly report referred to was that of 21 September, when nineteen deaths had been reported (Appendix, p. 670).

² A clear reference to Davenant's patent of 26 March 1639 to erect a new theatre in Fleet street (see Adams, pp. 424-6). For the rest of Heton's 'Instructions' see below, pp. 684-7.

another place in the same document he proposes that the company enter into articles to continue at the Salisbury Court for seven years 'upon the same condicions they haue had for a yeare and halfe last past'. If the company had been at the Salisbury Court a year and a half in March or April, 1639, they must have come to the theatre about October 1637. Clearly the new Queen Henrietta's company was completely organized during the plague of 1636-7 and opened at the Salisbury Court on 2 October 1637.

This man Heton must have been a very important factor in the existence of the Queen's men at the Salisbury Court. One gathers from the papers he left that he was not an easy master. In 1639 he was applying for complete control of the organization so that he might dismiss members or break the company when he chose. Apparently he wished to establish himself in a position similar to Beeston's at the Cockpit; he may even have had ambitions to become a second Henslowe. The difficulties to which he vaguely refers and the provisions which he wishes to make against future insubordination on the part of the players indicate frequent difficulties between the company and the manager of the Salisbury Court.

When the Queen's company came to the Salisbury Court, Richard Brome was the chief poet for that theatre, having signed a contract in July 1635 to write for three years for the Salisbury Court alone.¹ Though the evidence is not conclusive it is probable that the first play of Brome's which Queen Henrietta's men produced at their new theatre was *The English Moor, or the Mock Marriage*. The title-page of the first edition of this play in 1659 says that it was performed 'by Her Majesties Servants', and the prologue seems to indicate, as Fleay has pointed out,² that it was acted in 1637 after the plague. This prologue seems also to indicate that the company had recently been suppressed for meddling with state affairs, but no such suppression is known.³

¹ See below, p. 295.

² Fleay, *Biog. Chron.* 1. 39-40.

³ The prologue is worth quoting for its veiled references.

Most noble, fair and curteous to ye all
 Welcome and thanks we give, that you would call
 And visit your poor servants, that have been
 So long and pitiless unheard, unseen.
 Welcome, you'l say your money that does do,
 (Dissembling is a fault) we say so too,
 And your long absence was no fault of your,
 But our sad fate to be so long obscure,

In August 1638 a new contract with Brome was drawn up for a period of seven years, and the dramatist's weekly wage was increased to twenty shillings. Under this new contract Brome wrote two more plays for the company, one some time after Christmas in the winter of 1638-9, and another before Easter, 1639,¹ but thereafter he deserted them for William Beeston and his company at the Cockpit. There is evidence that Brome wanted to break away from the Queen's men even before 1639, for his note to the reader at the end of *The Antipodes*, which, according to the 1640 title-page, was 'Acted in the yeare 1638. by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at Salisbury Court in Fleet-street', says:

Courteous Reader, You shal find in this Booke more then was presented upon the Stage, and left out of the Presentation, for superfluous length (as some of the Players pretended) I thought good al should be inserted according to the allowed Original, and as it was, at first, intended for the Cock-pit Stage, in the right of my most deserving Friend Mr. William Beeston, unto whom it properly appertained; and so I leave it to thy perusal, as it was generally applauded, and well acted at Salisbury Court Farewell, R¹ Brome

This same play indicates that Queen Henrietta's men, in addition to a domineering manager and a discontented playwright, had still another difficulty to contend with in this time. The King's men were attracting much attention by their elaborate presentation of courtiers' plays in costumes

Jove and the Muses grant, and all good Men,
 We feel not that extremity again.
 The thought of which yet chills us with a fear
 That we have bought our liberty too dear.
 For should we fall into a new restraint,
 Our hearts must break that did before but faint.
 You noble, great and good ones, that vouchsafe
 To see a Comedy, and sometimes laugh
 Or smile at wit and harmless mirth, As thus
 ye have begun to grace and succour us,
 Be further pleas'd (to hold us still upright,
 For our relief, and for your own delight)
 To move for us to those high powers whom we
 submit unto in all humility,
 For our proceeding, and we'll make it good
 To utter nothing may be understood
 Offensive to the state, manners or time,
 We will as well look to our necks as climb
 You hear our sute, obtain it if you may,
 Then find us money, and we'll find you play.

¹ Andrews, *Brome*, pp. 13-15. The company refused to accept the second play. Their refusal may have been of some significance in Brome's desertion of the company.

which, in one case at least,¹ had been given them and which must have been far handsomer than anything the players could afford. To rival companies Suckling's gift no doubt seemed to provide unfair competition, and Brome complained about it in the first verse of the prologue to *The Antipodes*:

Opinion, *which our Author cannot court,*
(For the deare daintinesse of it) has, of late,
From the old way of Playes possess a Sort
Only to run to those, that carry state
In Scene magnificent and language high;
And Cloathes worth all the rest, except the Action.
And such are only good those Leaders cry,
And into that beleefe draw on a Faction,
That must despise all sportive, merry Wit,
Because some such great Play had none in it.²

¹ Suckling gave them the costumes which had been made for *Aglaura* at a cost of three or four hundred pounds. See above, pp 57-8

² It is amusing to note that Brome's indignation about *Aglaura* was not sufficiently relieved by the prologue to *The Antipodes*. He returned to the attack in the prologue to *The Court Beggar*, sneering at the new taste and declaring that in his play,

no gaudy Sceane

Shall give instructions, what his plot doth meane
Aglaura annoyed him even after it was published, and the following verses, printed in *Five New Plays*, 1659, called '*Upon Aglaura printed in Fohio*', are as spiteful as they are diverting.

By this large Margent did the Poet mean
 To have a Comment writ upon his Scene?
 Or is it that the Ladies, who ne're look
 On any but a Poeme or Play-book,
 May, in each page, have space to scribble down
 When such a Lord, or Fashion comes to Town.
 As Swaines in Almanacks account do keep,
 When their Cow calv'd, and when they bought their sheep?
 Ink is the life of Paper. 'tis meet then,
 That this which scap'd the Press should feel the Pen.
 A Room with one side furnish'd, or a face
 Painted half-way, is but a faire disgrace
 This great voluminous Pamphlet may be said
 To be like one that hath more haire then head;
 More excrement then body. Trees, which sprout
 With broadest leaves, have still the smallest fruit.
 When I saw so much white, I did begin
 To think *Aglaura* either did lie in,
 Or else took Pennance Never did I see
 (Unlesse in Bills dasht In the Chancerie).
 So little in so much; as if the feet
 Of Poetry, like Law, were sold by th'sheet.
 If this new fashion should but last one yeare,
 Poets, as Clerks, would make our paper dear.
 Doth not the Artist erre, and blast his fame,
 That sets out pictures lesser then the frame?

Still, whatever the difficulties of the Queen's men in this first year at the Salisbury Court, they enjoyed more prosperity than other companies had had on leaving the Cockpit. A warrant for liveries for fourteen members of the company was delivered to Richard Perkins 20 December 1638,¹ and on 6 March 1639/40 Turner was paid for seven plays given by them at court in 1638 and 1639.² On 30 October 1639 Herbert licensed Shirley's *Gentleman of Venice* for them.³

From 1639 to the closing of the theatres, the records of all the companies are meagre. The perilous state of the country was becoming more and more apparent to all men, as the letters of the time abundantly show, and the affairs of the theatres must have seemed very trivial in comparison with the latest speeches from Westminster, rumours from Whitehall, or the news from the North. The state of mind of London is well expressed by the Master of Charterhouse, who had written many letters touching on theatrical affairs, but who wrote on 20 May 1639:

I say nothing of the *Scotish* Businesses: Your Lordship hears quicker and more true Relations of the Passages there from other Pens than I can write. 'Tis our whole Discourse here, nothing else is spoken of. Home Businesses we have none. The Courts at *Westminster* all this Term, especially the Law-Courts rise by eleven of the Clock, there is nothing to do Little Trade amongst

Was ever Chamberlaine so mad, to dare
To lodge a childe in the great Bed at *Ware* ?
Aglaura would please better, did she lie
I' th' narrow bounds of an Eptomie
Pieces that are weav'd of the finest twist,
(As Silk and Plush) have still more stuffe then list.
She, that in Persian habit made great brags,
Degenerates in this excesse of rags,
Who, by her Giant-bulk this only gaines,
Perchance in Libraries to hang in chaines
'Tis not in Book, as Cloth; we never say
Make *London*-measure, when we buy a Play.
But rather have them pair'd Those leaves be faire
To the judicious, which more spotted are
Give me the sociable Pocket-books.
These empty *Folio's* only please the Cooks
R. B.

¹ See *M.S.C.* ii. 388.

² *Ibid.*, p. 392. The name given in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book is 'Henry Turner', but the name of the Queen's player had always been given as Anthony before, and he appears as Anthony in the warrant for liveries less than a year later. Surely the 'Henry' is a mistake of the clerk.

³ *Herbert*, p. 38. Herbert's entry does not name the company, but the title-page of the 1655 quarto bears the words, 'Presented at the Private house in Salisbury Court by her Majesties Servants'.

our Merchants, no buying of Land, all Things are at a stand, Men's Eyes being fixed only on the Issue of this *Scottish* Business.¹

It was not only the alarming uncertainty of political affairs which handicapped the players in this time, however; the plague situation was again serious in 1640. The deaths had reached forty-one per week by 23 July,² but for some reason the Council did not order the theatres closed until 11 September³ By the end of October the death-rate had decreased again, and the theatres were allowed to reopen not later than the first week in November.⁴

On 8 January 1640/1 the usual warrant for liveries for fourteen of the company was issued.⁵ Only Richard Perkins and Anthony Turner were mentioned by name

The plague returned in 1641. If my reading of Chalmers's extracts from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book is correct, the theatres were closed 5 August 1641.⁶ Though it is not known when they were reopened, it was probably some time in November, certainly before the 1st of December, for Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw a play on that day.⁷

Nothing is known of the affairs of the Queen's men from the reopening of the theatres after the plague of 1641 to their final closing by order of Parliament, 2 September 1642.⁸

LISTS AND CHARTS

The lists, charts, and repertory which follow have been constructed on the same principles as those of preceding companies.

The sources for the lists of the members of the company are as follows:

- 1 1630 quarto. For the date of the list, see above, pp. 220-2
- 2 1629 quarto. For the date, see Nason, *Shurley*, pp. 40-1
- 3 *M.S.C.*, ii 350.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 352-3
- 5 1631 quarto
- 6 1655 quarto The cast must date not later than 1634 because in that year Goad and Young of the cast are found in the King's Revels company
- 7 Appendix, p. 688. From Crosfield's *Diary*, pp. 71-3.
- 8 *M.S.C.* ii 374.
- 9 1637 quarto
- 10 *M.S.C.* ii. 388.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 396.

¹ *Strafford's Letters*, ii. 351.

² See Appendix, p. 670.

³ See Appendix, p. 665.

⁴ See Appendix, pp. 665-6.

⁵ *M.S.C.* ii 396.

⁶ See Appendix, p. 666.

⁷ See Appendix, p. 667

⁸ See below, p. 690.

LIVERY ALLOWANCES FOR QUEEN HENRIETTA'S MEN

<i>Date</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Payable to</i>	<i>Source</i>
19 June 1629	14	Christopher Beeston	<i>M S C</i> ii 350
20 Nov 1630	14	William Allen	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp 352-3
5 Dec 1632	14	[No one named]	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 359
16 Dec 1634	14	Christopher Beeston	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 374
20 Dec 1638	14	Richard Perkins	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 388
8 Jan 1640/1	14	Richard Perkins and Anthony Turner	<i>Ibid.</i> , p 396

The first extant livery warrant for the Queen's men contains the statement, 'theis lueryes are graunted vnto them once in two yeere & were new due at Michmās 1628', and all the others contain a similar statement. Evidently the arrangements for liveries for the Queen's men and for the King's men were much the same—the King's company received theirs every odd year at Easter, the Queen's every even year at Michaelmas. The Queen's men, like the King's, each received 4 yards of bastard scarlet for a cloak and a quarter yard of crimson velvet for a 'cape'. In earlier years the allowance for cloaks had been only 3 yards, but in 1627 it was changed to 4 for the King's players, though it remained only 3 for the Queen's until 1630. It is noteworthy that so long as the Queen's men played under Beeston at the Phoenix they received livery allowances for as many men as the King's did, but when the company was reorganized at the Salisbury Court, they continued to receive livery for fourteen, while the King's men were granted allowances for sixteen and finally eighteen men. It is also noteworthy that the allowances for the King's men were paid with much greater promptness than those for the Queen's. The King's men nearly always received their allowances within two or three weeks of Easter, and in 1633, 1639, and 1641 they received them before they were due. The Queen's men, on the other hand, were paid never less than seven weeks late, the allowance for 1640 was paid three months late and that for 1628 nearly nine months late.

The extant records of livery allowances leave two gaps in the series for the Queen's men, 1626 and 1636. It may be that the grant for 1628 was the first one made to Queen Henrietta's men, but the company had pretty surely been in existence at least two years by Michaelmas 1628, and the wording of the warrant for 1628, 'theis lueryes are graunted

vnto them once in two yeere', suggests that this was not the first grant. I am inclined to think that a warrant for 1626 has been lost, as the King's company's warrants for 1625 and 1627 have been.

Probably no grant was ever made for the year 1636. At Michaelmas of that year the theatres had all been closed for four and one-half months, and it may be that Queen Henrietta's men had already broken. Other grants were made in this plague period, for the King's men received their regular allowance 22 April 1637, nearly six months before the re-opening of the theatres. Grants were renewed in 1638 for the new or reorganized Queen Henrietta's company which was established at Salisbury Court through the efforts of Sir Henry Herbert, Richard Heton, and the Earl of Dorset.

PROVINCIAL NOTICES¹

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
22 Dec 1632	Doncaster	Murray, ii 257
22 June 1633	Norwich	Ibid., p. 354
1635	Craven District	Ibid., p. 255 ²
2 Dec 1635-20 Nov. 1636	Coventry	Ibid., p. 252

¹ Professor Murray (Murray, i 269, and ii. 101-5) says that the Queen Henrietta's London company does not appear in the provinces and that the provincial records all refer to a provincial company. These are the only records during the period of the existence of Queen Henrietta's company that refer to a Queen's company. It seems to me that if a separate provincial Queen Henrietta's troupe had been in existence, more records than these would have been left in the provinces.

² The entry reads, 'To a certeyne company of roguish players who represented "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" . . . 100.' Since Queen Henrietta's men owned the play, they may well have been the 'roguish players', but as the play was in print some other group may have appropriated it.

notes cont from p. 249]

Play, And of the Actors that first Acted it on the Stage, and often before their *Majesties*'. Since this cast includes both Christopher Goad and John Young, who belonged to the King's Revels in 1634, the court performances must have occurred before that date.

^g And one other day. See above, pp. 232-3.

^h The title-page of the 1635 quarto says that the play was performed at court by the Queen's men. This quarto contains an elegy on Lady Venetia Digby, who died in 1633, as noted by Steele from Fleay, but this is no evidence as to the date of the court performance.

ⁱ The nine performances for which Beeston was paid probably included those of *The Duke's Mistress* and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*.

^j 'Henry' Turner was payee, probably a clerk's error for Anthony Turner.

PLAYS PRESENTED AT COURT BY QUEEN
HENRIETTA'S COMPANY

Production date	Plays given	Amt	Paid	Source
Oct 1629— Feb 1629/30	10	£ 100	5 July 1630	M.S.C. ii 352
10 Oct 1630— 20 Feb 1630/1 ^a	16 ^b	170	25 May 1631 ^c	Ibid, p 355
'October &c 1631' [No date given]	9	100	5 Dec 1632 ^c	Ibid, p 359
>1633 ^d	14 <i>The Jew of Malta</i>	240	27 Oct 1633	Ibid, p 361
1633	[Not given] ^e	70	31 Dec 1634 ^c	1633 title-page M.S.C. ii 374
19 Nov 1633	<i>The Young Admiral</i>	.	.	Herbert, p 53
16 Dec. 1633	<i>Hymen's Holiday</i>	.	..	Ibid, p 53
14 Jan. 1633/4	<i>A Tale of a Tub</i>	.	..	Ibid, p 54
30 Jan 1633/4	<i>The Night Walkers</i>	Ibid, p 54
6 Feb 1633/4	<i>The Gamester</i>	.	.	Ibid, pp 54-5
>1634 ^f	<i>King John and Matilda</i>	.	..	Dramatis personae 1655 4 ^o
1634	8	90	24 March 1635/6 ^c	M.S.C. ii 378
19 Nov 1634 ^g	<i>Love's Mistress</i>	..	.	[See above, pp. 232-3]
>1635 ^h	<i>Shepherd's Holiday</i>	..	.	1635 title-page
1635	9 ⁱ	130	10 May 1637 ^c	M.S.C. ii 383
22 Feb 1635/6	<i>The Duke's Mistress</i>	Herbert, p 56
28 Feb 1635/6	<i>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</i>	Ibid
1638-9	7	80	6 March 1639/40 ^j	M.S.C. ii. 392

^a The warrant says, 'Acted betweene the 10th of October & the 20th of Februarie 1631', but as the warrant is dated 25 May 1631 (and this date must be correct, since the warrant comes between two others dated 27 April and 18 October 1631), the scribe evidently should have written 1630.

^b Probably the sixteen include Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*, whose court performance is several times referred to in the edition of 1631. *The Fair Maid of the West* was given at Hampton Court, for the court prologue and epilogue printed in the 1631 edition are reprinted in *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas* under the heading, 'Spoken to their two Majesties at Hampton Court'. Now three of the sixteen plays presented at court between 10 October 1630 and 20 February 1630/1 were performed at Hampton Court, for the Lord Chamberlain's warrant for payment for them has the following note attached to it. 'M^d his LoP added (above the ordinary Allowance of 10^{li} for every play) 10^{li} more in consideration of their Charge in Attending at Hampton Court where they Acted three playes' (M.S.C. ii 355). Apparently none of the plays of the 1629-30 season was acted at Hampton Court.

^c Beeston was payee for the company

^d The title-page of the 1633 edition records a performance at court. Heywood wrote a prologue for this court performance which was printed in *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas*, 1637

^e The performances for which Beeston was paid £70 probably included the five plays immediately following.

^f The dramatis personae is headed, 'The Names of the Persons in the
[notes cont. opp.]

THE REPERTORY OF QUEEN HENRIETTA'S
COMPANY 1625-42

BEAUMONT and FLETCHER *The Coronation*. (See JAMES SHIRLEY)

— *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* 1st ed. 1613, the title-page of the 2nd ed., 1635, says, 'As it is now Acted by Her Majesties Servants at the Private house in Drury lane. 1635' It was acted 28 February 1635/6 'by the Q men at St. James' (Herbert, p. 56), but was the property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (M.S.C. ii. 389-90.)

— *The Night Walker* 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'A Comedy, As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the Private House in Drury Lane' 'For a play of Fletchers corrected by Sherley called *The Night Walkers*, the 11 May, 1633.—£2 0. 0 For the queen's players' (Herbert, p. 34). Presented at court 30 January 1633/4; no company named (ibid., p. 54) Property of Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (M.S.C. ii. 389-90)

— *Wit without Money* 1st ed. 1639, the title-page says, 'A Comedie, As it hath beene Presented with good Applause at the private house in Drurie Lane, by her Majesties Servants' John Greene saw it performed 10 June 1635; though he does not mention the theatre, it must have been the Cockpit (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 387) Presented at court 14 February 1636/7 by Beeston's Boys (Herbert, p. 58) and listed as their property in the Lord Chamberlain's list of 10 August 1639. (M.S.C. ii. 389-90.)

BROME, RICHARD *The Antipodes*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'Acted in the yeare 1638. by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at Salisbury Court in Fleet-street'

— *The English Moor, or The Mock Marriage*. 1st ed. 1659 in *Five New Plays* Separate title-page dated 1658 says, 'A Comedie as it was often acted with general applause, by Her Majesties Servants'.

CARLELL, LODOVICK. *The Fool Would Be a Favourite*. 1st ed. 1657 in *Two New Plays*, whose title-page says, 'As they have been often acted, by the Queen's Majesty's Servants, with great applause'. However, the other play in the volume, *Osmond, the Great Turk*, was really a King's play, and it may be that *The Fool Would Be a Favourite* was too. (See above, pp. 116-17.)

— *Osmond, the Great Turk*. Not a Queen's company play, in spite of the title-page. (See *The Fool Would Be a Favourite* above, and pp. 116-17.)

CHAPMAN and SHIRLEY. *The Ball*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the private House in Drury Lane'. Licensed 16 November 1632;

- no company named (*Herbert*, p. 34), see above, pp. 228-9, for an account of the censorship of this play.
- *Chabot, Admiral of France* 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the private House in Drury Lane' Licensed 29 April 1635, no company named (*Herbert*, p. 36) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)
- DAVENPORT, ROBERT. *The City Night Cap* 1st ed. 1661; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with great Applause, by Her Majesties Servants, at the Phoenix in Drury Lane'. Licensed 14 October 1624. 'For the Cockpit Company, A new Play, called, *The City Night Cap*. Written by Davenport' (*Herbert*, p. 29) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)
- *King John and Matilda* 1st ed. 1655, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with great Applause by Her Majesties Servants at the Cock-pit in Drury-lane'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)
- DEKKER, THOMAS *The Honest Whore* 1st ed. 1604, the 1635 title-page says, 'As it hath beene Acted by her Maiesties Servants with great Applause'. Since this statement is not found in the 1604, 1605, 1615, or 1616 editions, the title-page probably, though not certainly, refers to Queen Henrietta's and not Queen Anne's company.
- DEKKER, FORD, and ROWLEY *The Witch of Edmonton* 1st ed. 1658; the title-page says, 'Acted by the Princes Servants, often at the Cock-Pit in Drury-Lane, once at Court . . .' This original ownership by the Prince's men is verified by the record of the court performance, but there was a revival, as is clearly indicated by the prologue (see Theophilus Bird). At the end of this prologue in the 1658 quarto is printed, 'Mr Bird', probably indicating the speaker, not the writer; at the end of the epilogue spoken by Winifred is 'Phen'. There is no record of either of these actors as Prince's men, in fact Theophilus Bird was only thirteen when the play was first produced and certainly would not have been called 'Mr.' Both Fenn and Bird appear as Queen Henrietta's men, the company which succeeded the successors of the Prince's company at the Cockpit. Bird had female roles about 1630, but by 1635 he had a fairly important male part in *Hannibal and Scipio*, and he might, therefore, have been called 'Mr' Fenn had a female role in *Hannibal and Scipio*, as he did in *The Witch of Edmonton*, but by 1637 he seems to have been a responsible member of the company (see Fenn, 'Players'). Either 1635 or 1636, then, seems a possible date for the revival of *The Witch of Edmonton* by Queen Henrietta's men. The other names in the quarto of 1658, W. Mago,

Dekker, Ford, and Rowley (*cont.*)

W Hamluc, Rowland, and Jack, cannot be certainly identified as either Prince's men or Queen's men, but, if they are actors' names, they probably derive from the earlier production.

FLETCHER, JOHN. (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER.)

FORD, JOHN *The Fancies Chaste and Noble*. 1st ed. 1638, the title-page says, 'Presented by the Queenes Maiesties Servants, At the Phoenix in Drury-lane'.

— *Love's Sacrifice*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'Acted by the Queenes Majesties Seruants at the Phoenix in Drury-lane'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (M.S.C. ii. 389-90.)

— *Perkin Warbeck*. 1st ed. 1634; the title-page says, 'Acted (some-times) by the Queenes Maiesties Servants at the Phoenix in Drurie lane'.

— *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. 1st ed. 1633, the title-page says, 'Acted by the Queenes Maiesties Seruants, at The Phoenix in Drury-Lane'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (M.S.C. ii. 389-90.)

— *The Witch of Edmonton*. (See THOMAS DEKKER.)

GLAPTHORNE, HENRY. *The Hollander*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'A Comedy written 1635. . . . And now Printed as it was then Acted at the Cock-pit in Drury lane, by their Majesties Servants, with good allowance. And at the Court before both their Majesties' The play was not written for Beeston's Boys, however, but for Queen Henrietta's men, as is proved by the licence quoted by W. J. Lawrence (*T L S.*, 29 November 1923): 'For the Queen's Company. For a new play called *Love's Tryall, or the Hollander* this 12 March, 1635[6] . . . £200.'

HEMINGES, WILLIAM. *The Fatal Contract*. 1st ed. 1653; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with great Applause by her Majesties Servants'.

HEYWOOD, THOMAS *The English Traveller*. 1st ed. 1633, the title-page says, 'As it hath beene Publikely acted at the Cock-Pit in Drury-lane: By Her Maiesties seruants'.

— *The Fair Maid of the West*, I and II. 1st ed. 1631; the title-page says, 'As it was lately acted before the King and Queen, with approved liking. *By the Queens Majesties Comedians*'.

— *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*. 1st ed. 1605. Heywood published in his *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas* (1637) 'A Prologue to the Play of Queene Elizabeth as it was last revived at the Cock-pit'. The revival referred to was evidently between 1626 (for the prologue says that the play is more than twenty-one years old, and it was written in 1605) and 1637, when the prologue was printed. Queen

Henrietta's men were at the Cockpit during this entire period. The prologue is also found in 1639 ed. HN.

- *Love's Mistress*. 1st ed. 1636, the title-page says, 'As it was three times presented before their two Excellent Maesties, within the space of eight dayes, In the presence of sundry Forraigne Ambassadors *Publikely Acted by the Queens Comoedians, At the Phoenix in Drury-lane*'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M S C* ii. 389-90)
 - *A Maidenhead Well Lost* 1st ed. 1634; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene publickly Acted at the Cocke-pit in Drury-lane, with much Applause. By her Maesties Seruants'.
 - *The Rape of Lucrece* 1st ed. 1608; the title-page says that the play was acted by Queen Anne's men at the Red Bull. George Bullen, writing in *The Athenaeum* for 18 October 1879, gives the following extract from a newsletter of August 1628 concerned chiefly with the activities of the Duke of Buckingham 'On Wenesday his Grace was also spectator of y^e Rape of Lucrece at y^e Cocke-pitt.' This same item, almost verbatim, is found in a letter from Robert Gell to Sir Martyn Stutville which was published by Halliwell-Phillipps in *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, ii. 210. (See *Henry VIII* in the repertory of the King's company, pp. 128-9.) Queen Henrietta's men occupied the Cockpit in 1628 *The Rape of Lucrece* was the property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M S C*. ii. 389-90.)
 - *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject* 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene Acted with great Applause by the Queenes Maesties Servants'.
- HEYWOOD and ROWLEY. *Fortune by Land and Sea*. 1st ed. 1655; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with great Applause by the Queens Servants'. One cannot be sure whether the players were Queen Anne's or Queen Henrietta's men
- JONSON, BENJAMIN. *A Tale of a Tub*. 1st ed. in 1640 folio. Licensed 7 May 1633 with note of censorship, but no mention of company. '*The Tale of the Tub* was acted on tusday night at Court, the 14 Janua. 1633[/4], by the Queenes players, and not likte.' (*Herbert*, pp. 34 and 54.)
- KILLIGREW, THOMAS. *Claracilla*. 1st ed. 1641 in *The Prisoners and Claracilla*; the title-page says, 'As they were presented at the *Phoenix in Drury-Lane*, by her M^{ties} Servants'.
- *The Prisoners*. 1st ed. 1641 in *The Prisoners and Claracilla*; the title-page says, 'As they were presented at the *Phoenix in Drury-Lane*, by her M^{ties} Servants'.
- LOVELACE, RICHARD. *The Scholars*. Not extant. In Lovelace's *Lucasta* (1649) is 'A Prologue to the Scholars. A Comedy presented at the White-Fryers'. It must have been presented during the period of the Queen's company's occupancy of the

Lovelace, Richard (*cont*)

Salisbury Court, not infrequently called Whitefriars, for Lovelace was given his honorary M.A. at Oxford 31 August 1636, was incorporated at Cambridge 4 October 1637, and seems not to have come to London before 1638. (Wilkinson, *Lovelace*, pp. xx and xxi)

MARLOWE, CHRISTOPHER *The Jew of Malta*. 1st ed. 1633, the title-page says, 'As it was playd before the King and Queene, in his Majesties Theatre at White-Hall, by her Majesties Servants at the Cock-pit'.

MARMION, SHAKERLEY *The Antiquary* 1st ed. 1641; the title-page says, 'A Comedy, Acted by Her Maesties Servants at The Cock-Pit'

MASSINGER, PHILIP. *The Great Duke of Florence* 1st ed. 1636; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene often presented with good allowance by her Maties Servants at the Phoenix in Drurie Lane' *The Great Duke*, licensed 'for the Queen's Servants' 5 July 1627, is probably this play (*Herbert*, p. 31). Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90)

— *The Maid of Honour* 1st ed. 1632, the title-page says, 'As it hath beene often presented with good allowance at the Phoenix in Drurie-Lane, by the Queenes Majesties Servants'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90)

— *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene often acted at the Phoenix in Drury-Lane, by the Queenes Maesties seruants' In the account books of the Clifford family under date of 1635 appears the following entry. 'To a certeyne company of roguish players who represented "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" . . . 100' (*Murray*, ii 255) Presumably the 'roguish players' were Queen Henrietta's men on tour. See above, p. 248. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90.)

— *The Renegado*. 1st ed. 1630, the title-page says, 'As it hath beene often acted by the Queenes Maesties seruants, at the priuate Play-house in Drurye-Lane' Licensed 17 April 1624: 'For the Cockpit, *The Renegado, or the Gentleman of Venice*: Written by Messenger' (*Herbert*, p. 28). Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (See *M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)

MIDDLETON, THOMAS. *A Mad World, My Masters*. 1st ed. 1608; the title-page of the 1640 ed. says, 'As it hath bin often Acted at the Private House in Salisbury Court, by her Majesties Servants'

MIDDLETON and ROWLEY *The Changeling*. 1st ed. 1653; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted (with great Applause) at the Privat house in Drury-Lane and Salisbury Court'. Mention of these two theatres normally indicates a Queen Henrietta's play, for no other company occupied both houses.

- 'Licensed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix, May 7, 1622.' (W. J. Lawrence, quoting Malone, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923, p. 820) John Greene saw *The Changeling* in March 1634/5. (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 386) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90)
- *The Spanish Gypsy* 1st ed. 1653, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted (with great Applause) at the Privat House in Drury-Lane, and Salisbury Court' Mention of these two theatres normally indicates a Queen Henrietta's play, for no other company occupied both houses Licensed to be 'Acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants at the Phoenix' (W. J. Lawrence, *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923) Acted at court 5 November 1623 'by the Cockpitt company'. (*Herbert*, p. 51) Property of Beeston's Boys 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90)
- NABBES, THOMAS *Covent Garden*. 1st ed. 1638, the title-page says, 'Acted in the Yeare, MDCXXXII By the Queenes Majesties Servants'.
- *Hannibal and Scipio* 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'Acted in the yeare 1635 by the Queenes Majesties Servants, at their Private house in Drury Lane'.
- *Microcosmus*. 1st ed. 1637, the title-page says, 'A Morall Maske, Presented with generall liking, at the private house in Salisbury Court, and heere Set down according to the intention of the Authour'. The complimentary verses by Richard Brome contain the following lines:

*Were the restraint ta'ne off, our eares and sight
Should fetch new shares of profit and delight
From this thy worke or World, and the supplies
That shall from thy Divine Minerva rise.
And friend I hope the stage agen will shine,
In part for mine own sake as well as thine.*

Evidently Brome's verses were written during the long plague closing of 1636-7, at which time Nabbes's masque had not yet been produced (Brome ought to be reliable on this matter, since he was at the time the regular dramatist under contract at the Salisbury Court) The Salisbury Court performance referred to on the title-page must, therefore, be one after the plague of 1636-7, at which time Queen Henrietta's men occupied that theatre. The moral masque, then, evidently belonged to the Queen's men.

- *Tottenham Court*. 1st ed. 1638; the title-page says, 'Acted in the Yeare MDCXXXIII. At the private House in Salisbury-Court'. The title-page of the third issue, 1639, says, 'Acted at the private house in Salisburie-Court, by the Queenes Majesties Servants'. If both title-pages are to be accepted, the Queen's men must have inherited the play from the

Nabbes, Thomas (*cont.*)

former occupants of the Salisbury Court. Or it may be that the first title-page means, 'First acted 1633. Now acted at the Salisbury Court', and that the first performance was at the Phoenix

ROWLEY, WILLIAM *All's Lost by Lust*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, '*Divers times Acted by the Lady Elizabeths Servants. And now lately by her Maiesties Servants, with great applause, at the Phoenix in Drury Lane*'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M S.C.* ii. 389-90)

— *Fortune by Land and Sea*. (See HEYWOOD.)

— *Hymen's Holiday* Not extant 'Received of Biston, for anould play called *Hymen's Holliday*, newly revived at their house, being a play given unto him for my use, this 15 Aug 1633, 3^l o. o. Received of him for some alterations in it 1^l o. o.' (*Herbert*, p. 35.) No company is named for the court performance of '*Hymens Holliday or Cupids Fegarys*, anould play of Rowleys' on 16 December 1633. (*Ibid.*, p. 53.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *The Witch of Edmonton* (See DEKKER)

RUTTER, JOSEPH. *The Shepherd's Holiday*. 1st ed. 1635; the title-page says, 'Acted Before Both Their Maiesties at White-Hall, by the Queenes Servants'.

SHARPE, LEWIS. *The Noble Stranger*. 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted at the Private House in Salisbury Court, by her Maiesties Servants'.

SHIRLEY, HENRY. *The Martyred Soldier*. 1st ed. 1638; the title-page says, 'As it was sundry times Acted with a generall applause at the Private house in Drury lane, and at other publicke Theaters. By the Queenes Majesties servants'. The address to the reader at the end of the play says, 'That this play's old, 'tis true . . .', but the same address is found appended to Heywood's *Royal King and Loyal Subject*, printed by the same printer, 1637.

SHIRLEY, JAMES *The Arcadia*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'Acted by her Majesties Servants at the Phoenix in Drury Lane'.

— *The Ball*. (See CHAPMAN.)

— *The Bewties*. (See *The Bird in a Cage*.)

— *The Bird in a Cage*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene Presented at the Phoenix in Drury-Lane. The Author Iames Shirley, Servant to Her Majesty'. Licensed as *The Bewties* (see Nason, *Shirley*, p. 72) 21 January 1632/3; Shirley is named as the author, but there is no indication of the company. (*Herbert*, p. 34.)

— *Chabot, Admiral of France*. (See CHAPMAN and SHIRLEY.)

— *The Constant Maid*. 1st ed. 1640; the 1661 edition, which is

called *Love will finde out the Way* and which gives 'T.B.' for the author (no doubt because these initials are signed to the epilogue, which first appears in this edition of the play), says on the title-page, 'As it was Acted with great Applause, by Her Majesties Servants, at the Phoenix in *Drury Lane*'

- *The Coronation* 1st ed 1640, the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants at the private House in Drury Lane' Licensed 6 February 1634/5 as by James Shirley (*Herbert*, p 36) Property of Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (M S C ii 389-90)
- *The Duke* (See *The Humorous Courtier*)
- *The Duke's Mistress* 1st ed. 1638, the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, At the private House in Drury-Lane' Licensed 18 January 1635/6 with no mention of company (*Herbert*, p 37), presented at court 22 February 1635/6 by an unnamed company. (Ibid , p 56.)
- *The Example* 1st ed 1637, the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants At the private House in Drury-Lane' Licensed 24 June 1634 with no mention of company (*Herbert*, p 36) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (M S.C ii 389-90.)
- *The Faithful Servant*. (See *The Grateful Servant*.)
- *The Gamester* 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants At the private House in Drury-Lane'. Licensed 11 November 1633 (*Herbert*, p 35) and presented at court 6 February 1633/4 (ibid , p 54); no company is named in either case.
- *The Gentleman of Venice* 1st ed. 1655; the title-page says, 'Presented at the Private house in Salisbury Court by her Majesties Servants'. Licensed 30 October 1639 with no indication of company (*Herbert*, p. 38)
- *The Grateful Servant* 1st ed. 1630, the title-page says, 'As it was lately presented with good applause at the private House in Drury-Lane, By her Majesties Servants'. '*The Faithful Servant*, by James Shirley, licensed' 3 November 1629. (*Herbert*, p 33) Adams and Nason agree that *The Faithful Servant* is a variant title for *The Grateful Servant*. Under the latter title it was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (M.S.C. ii. 389-90)
- *The Humorous Courtier*. 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'As it hath been presented with good applause at the private house in Drury-Lane'. It is probably to be identified with *The Duke* (see Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 102-3), which was licensed by Herbert as Shirley's play but with no mention of the company on 17 May 1631. (*Herbert*, p. 33.)
- *Hyde Park*. 1st ed. 1637, the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the private house in

Shirley, James (*cont.*)

Drury Lane'. Licensed 20 April 1632 with no mention of company. (*Herbert*, p. 34.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90.)

— *The Lady of Pleasure*. 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted by her Majesties Servants, at the private House in Drury Lane'. Licensed 15 October 1635 with no indication of ownership. (*Herbert*, p. 37.) John Greene saw it at the Cockpit 6 November 1635 (Symonds, 'Diary', p. 389), and Sir Humphrey Mildmay 'wente to the La. of pleasure & sawe that rare playe' 8 December 1635, but he mentions no theatre nor company. (See Appendix, p. 677.) Property of Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii 389-90.)

— *Love's Cruelty*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the private House in Drury Lane'. Licensed 14 November 1631 with no mention of company. (*Herbert*, p. 33.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *Love-Tricks with Compliments*. (See *The School of Compliment*.)

— *The Maid's Revenge*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene Acted with good Applause at the private house in Drury Lane by her Majesties Servants'. Licensed 9 February 1625/6 with no mention of company (*Herbert*, p. 31.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *The Night Walker*. (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER.)

— *The Opportunity*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'As it was presented by her Majesties Servants, at the private House in Drury Lane'. Licensed 29 November 1634 with no mention of company. (*Herbert*, p. 36.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *The Politician*. 1st ed. 1655; the title-page says, 'Presented at Salisbury Court by her Majesties Servants'. Dyce's identification of this play with *The Politique Father*, licensed 26 May 1641, is almost certainly wrong. (See Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 47-54.)

— *The School of Compliment*. 1st ed. 1631; the title-page says, 'As it was acted by her Maiesties Seruants at the Priuate house in Drury Lane'. 'For the Cockpit Company; A new Play, called, *Love-Tricks with Compliments*,' was licensed 11 February 1624/5. (*Herbert*, p. 31.) Professor Adams identifies this play with *The School of Compliment*. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

— *The Trailor*. 1st ed. 1635; the title-page says, 'Acted By her Majesties Servants'. Licensed 4 May 1631 with no mention of company. (*Herbert*, p. 33.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639. (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90.)

- *The Wedding*. 1st ed. 1629; the title-page says, 'As it was lately Acted by her Maiesties Seruants, at the Phenix in Drury Lane'. Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M.S.C.* ii. 389-90)
 - *The Witty Fair One*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'As it was presented at the Private House in Drury Lane. By her Maiesties Servants'. Licensed 3 October 1628 with no mention of company. (*Herbert*, p. 32) Herbert's licence for printing is found at the end of the 1633 quarto, dated 14 January 1632/3 Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M S C.* ii. 389-90)
 - *The Young Admural*. 1st ed. 1637; the title-page says, 'As it was presented By her Majesties Servants, at the private house in Drury Lane' Licensed with commendations 3 July 1633 but with no mention of company (*Herbert*, pp. 19-20); presented at court 19 November 1633 'by the queen's players'. (*Ibid.*, p. 53.) Property of Beeston's Boys in 1639 (*M S.C.* ii. 389-90)
- WEBSTER, JOHN. *The White Devil*. 1st ed. 1612; the title-page of the 1631 edition says, 'As it hath bin diuers times Acted, by the Queenes Maiesties seruants, at the Phoenix, in Drury-lane'.

CHAPTER VII

THE KING AND QUEEN OF BOHEMIA'S COMPANY

THE existence of a King and Queen of Bohemia's company has never before been recognized, and there are still too few facts for a history of the organization to be written. Since there is, however, enough evidence to make it quite certain that such a company did exist, this evidence must be recorded here, and perhaps a few conjectures about the King and Queen of Bohemia's men may be in order.

The first and most definite record of the company is found in a certificate of privilege which was granted to them by the Lord Chamberlain.

Certificate for Players	A Certificate for y ^e Company of Players to his Mat ^{ie} and y ^e Princes Palatine of Rhine ¹ shewing y ^e Privi- ledges they are to enjoy by being Servants to their Highnesses. ²
-------------------------------	--

Though this certificate is undated, it occurs with several others of August and September 1626, and both the preceding and the succeeding entries are dated 10 September 1626, presumably the date of this certificate as well.

The second definite record of the company is also found in the Lord Chamberlain's books.

Queene of Bohemias Players for leaue to exercise th ^{ers}	A petition of the King & Queene of Bohemia's Players for leaue to exercise their quality beeing restrayned by y ^e Iustices therabouts. Answered (vizt) His Mat ^{ie} . is graciously pleased that the petr ^{rs} haue free liberty to exercise their quality of playing without restraint; any former Act of prohibition to y ^e contrary notwithstanding./ Dec 13 1630 / ³
--	--

¹ 'His Mat^{ie} and y^e Princes Palatine of Rhine' are more frequently called the King and Queen of Bohemia, or the Palsgrave and the Lady Elizabeth

² P.R.O., L.C. 3/31. This book is one which Miss Boswell did not use when she made her extracts for the Malone Society (*M.S.C.* ii. 321-416), and the certificate has never been printed before. The book covers the years 1688-96, but in the back reversed are twenty-one pages of letters from the Lord Chamberlain and warrants beginning 3 August 1626.

³ *M.S.C.* ii. 403. The date suggests that the company was restrained for fear of plague, for all theatres had been closed 17 April to 12 November in 1630.

The marginal note of the 'Queene of Bohemias Players' instead of the King and Queen of Bohemia's players is, I think, a mistake. Certainly there must be a mistake in either the body of the entry or the marginal note, and of the two the former ought to be the more reliable. The marginal notes in the Lord Chamberlain's books are not always accurate.

The third reference to this company is less direct. Like the others, it comes from the Lord Chamberlain's books at the Public Record Office; it is a record of a petition for permission to sue certain players

Atkins agst Gunnell &c / A petition of Iohn Atkins agst Rich^d Gunnell, W^m Cartwright Richard Fowler & Mathew Smith y^e Queene of Bohemias Players Answered (vizt) If Richard Gunnell &c' doe not g^{ue} the pet^r satisfaccōn heerin before the expiration of one moneth after the sight heerof, The pet^r may take the ordinary course of Law for his reliefe / eod' / [28 Nov 1631]¹

This petition is significant because of the coupling of the name of the company and the names of the players. Gunnell, Cartwright, and Fowler are all well known as players of the Palsgrave's company before 1625, and all three of them are concerned in the bond between Gunnell and six members of the Palsgrave's company to continue to play together at the Fortune in 1624.² None of the four ever appears either before or after this date as a Queen of Bohemia's man. It seems likely, therefore, that 'Queene of Bohemias Players' is a mistake for King and Queen of Bohemia's players, like the one in the marginal note of the petition of December 1630.³

There is an earlier petition in the Lord Chamberlain's books, dated 23 May 1627, which I think probably concerns this company, though I have no evidence more weighty than the similarity of the list of names. The four actors of the earlier petition are the same as the four in the petition of 1631, except that Richard Price appears instead of Mathew

¹ Ibid., p. 406

² See above, pp. 148-9.

³ An earlier record of Atkins's petition against the King and Queen of Bohemia's men was entered six weeks earlier (*M.S.C.* n. 406), but is of little help here, because no company is named. The petition follows:

Atkins agst Gunnell
Cartwright &c./

A petition of Iohn Atkins against Richard
Gunnell William Cartwright Richard Fowler
& Mathew Smith Answered of course Octo-

ber 18. 1631./

Smith. Since Price was buried at St. Giles Cripplegate, 23 July 1627,¹ the logical inference is that Smith had replaced Price after 1627 as a leading member of the company. The earlier petition reads as follows:

A petition of Thomas Saul against Richard Gunnell.
Saul against W^m. Cartwright, Richard Price and Richard Fowler
Gunnell &c / &c. answered of course. debt 50^l. May 23 1627./²

These petitions and the certificate of privilege make it sufficiently clear that a company called the King and Queen of Bohemia's company was playing in London in the first five or six years of the reign of Charles I. We have no conclusive evidence as to when the company was organized, from what earlier troupes it was formed, where it played, or how long it lasted. I think, however, that reasonable answers can be suggested for all four of these questions.

The company must have been formed before 10 September 1626, when the certificate of privilege for its members was issued. It cannot have been formed before March 1625, for before that month separate companies of the King of Bohemia and of the Queen of Bohemia are known to have been performing in London for several years.³ No combined company would have been formed while the two independent companies were still in existence. Furthermore, four of the five known members of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company are known to have been Palsgrave's men in April 1624.⁴ The new company cannot have begun to act between March 1625 and December 1625, for in these months all theatres were closed because of the terrible plague of 1625.⁵ The King and Queen of Bohemia's company must, therefore, have begun performing in London some time between 1 December 1625 and 10 September 1626. So far as I know, tickets or certificates of privilege were not issued immediately upon the formation of a new company; all those known were issued some time after the company's formation.⁶ It seems

¹ See 'Players'.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 401.

³ There is no reason to think that either the King of Bohemia's company or the Queen of Bohemia's company broke up before the plague closing of March 1625, though the last record of the latter is dated 11 February 1624/5, and of the former, 3 November 1624 (see above, pp. 186-8 and 150-3).

⁴ Gunnell, Cartwright, Price, and Fowler, who signed a bond to continue to play together in April 1624. (See above, pp. 148-9.) I am assuming that the petition of 1627 referred to the King and Queen of Bohemia's company, as did the one of 1631.

⁵ See Appendix, pp. 654-7.

⁶ See *M.S.C.* ii. 380, 389, 390-1, 394-5, and 397.

to me not unlikely, therefore, that the King and Queen of Bohemia's company began to play in London not long after the theatres were opened following the plague closing of 1625—i.e. in December 1625 or the first months of 1626.

The antecedents of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company may well have been the Lady Elizabeth's company and the Palsgrave's company, with perhaps a sprinkling of recruits from other London troupes which had broken during the plague of 1625. That the Lady Elizabeth's men and the Palsgrave's men were the chief sources of the new company is suggested by the fact that its name is a combination of those of the two Jacobean organizations. Furthermore, those two companies appear to have been the strongest of the Jacobean companies, exclusive of the King's men, when the theatres were closed in March 1625.

The derivation of the new company from the Palsgrave's men is strongly suggested by the fact that all but one of its known members are known also to have been Palsgrave's men.¹ Moreover, it will be remembered that in April 1624 seven Palsgrave's men—Charles Massey, William Cartwright, William Stratford, Richard Price, Richard Fowler, Andrew Cane, and Richard Gunnell—signed a bond to continue to play together at the Fortune, and Andrew Cane said in 1654 that none of them broke the bond.² Now four of these seven men, Richard Gunnell, William Cartwright, Richard Fowler, and Richard Price, are found associated with the King and Queen of Bohemia's company. Two others, Charles Massey and William Stratford, died in 1625.³ It looks very much as if the signatories had kept their bond by continuing to play together after the plague of 1625 not as the Palsgrave's men but by taking in new members and playing as the King and Queen of Bohemia's company.

This Palsgrave's bond of 1624 suggests the answer to our third question about the new company, where did they perform? Since the bond was made by six of the Palsgrave's men to a seventh, Richard Gunnell, who was manager of the Fortune, as well as a member of the company,³ and since the agreement was not only that the men continue to play together, but that they continue at the Fortune, the normal

¹ Gunnell, Cartwright, Fowler, and Price, if Price may be accepted as a member of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company. See 'Players'. The fifth man, Mathew Smith, is unknown as a player before 1631.

² See above, pp. 148-9.

³ See 'Players'.

conclusion is that the four Palsgrave's men of the bond who continued together as King and Queen of Bohemia's men played at the Fortune as the Palsgrave's company had. Even without our knowledge of the bond of 1624, Gunnell's presence in the new company would have suggested that the troupe played at the Fortune in which he owned stock.

A simple analysis of the companies known to have been acting in London from 1625 to 1629 and of the available theatres would also suggest the Fortune as the most likely playing place for the King and Queen of Bohemia's servants. In these years the only metropolitan companies are the King's men, Queen Henrietta's men, and the King and Queen of Bohemia's men. The best London theatres were the Blackfriars, the Phoenix, the Globe, and the Fortune, apparently ranking in public esteem in the order named. The King's men are known to have occupied the Blackfriars and the Globe, Queen Henrietta's men the Phoenix. The Fortune is the logical house for the third company.

For these reasons I think we are reasonably safe in assuming that the new company played at the Fortune. If so, there are several events known to have taken place at the Fortune in these years which are to be associated with the King and Queen of Bohemia's company.

If the troupe had begun to perform before May 1626, as I think they had, they were probably concerned in a riot which took place at their theatre early in that month. We know of this riot only from the recognizances taken for the appearance of certain of the rioters, several of whom were sailors and some of whom threatened that representatives of the navy would return later to wreak vengeance. Whether the riot began in the theatre and in connexion with a performance we do not know, but probably it did, since five of the six recognizances mention the theatre, and since one of the rioters threatened that the navy would pull down the building. We learn nothing of any damage to the playhouse, only that the rioters beat the constable, Francis Foster, assaulted Edward Heather, the Head borough, and beat Thomas Faulkner, 'an inhabitant at the Fortune Playhouse'. Faulkner is not known as an actor, though he may have been one. Possibly he was a caretaker, or merely the occupant of one of the tenements adjoining the theatre.¹ The statements in the Middlesex records are as follows:

¹ See *Hens. Paps.*, pp. 28-9.

16 May 1626. 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J P., of Robert Herringe of Shadwell in Stepney chirurgeon and William Smyth of St Margaret's Westminster yeoman, in the sum of fifty pounds each, and of James Carver of Shadwell, in the sum of one hundred marks, For the appearance of the said James Carver at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c. "Touchinge a daungerous and great ryott committed in Whitecrosstreete at the Fortune Playhouse and especially for strikinge beateinge and assaulting Francis Foster the constable and Thomas Faulkner, an inhabitant at the Fortune Playhouse" S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

16 May 1626. 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J.P., of James Carver sailer and William Foster cordwayner, both of Stepney co Midd., in the sum of fifty pounds each, and of Thomas Alderson of Stepney sayler, in the sum of one hundred marks; For the appearance of the said Thomas Alderson at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c. "touchinge a greate and daungerous ryott committed in Whitecrosstreete at the Fortune Playhouse, and for joyninge with the rest of the Riotters in beatinge and assaulting of Thomas Faulkener an inhabitant at the Fortune Playehouse, and beinge charged in the Kinges name to yeelede and keepe the peace hee saide hee cared not for the Kinge, for the Kinge paide them noe wages and therefore hee cared not, And further saynge hee would bringe the whole Navy thither, to pull downe the playehouse" S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

16 May 1626. 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J.P., of Thomas Alderson of Wappinge saylor and William Smyth of St Margaret's Westminster yeoman, in the sum of fifty pounds each, and of Richard Margrave of Wapping saylor, in the sum of one hundred marks; For the appearance of the said Richard Margrave at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c "for publishinge certaine discoveries of an intended assemblie at the Beare Garden, for revenge of an injurie done to a saylor, and that there would be a capten a drumme and cullors goe with them, and afterwards for denyinge itt on examinacion." S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

18 May 1626 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J P., of Robert Francke and William Collison, both of Blackwall in the parish of Stepney saylors, in the sum of fifty pounds each, and of Patrick Gray of Blackwall aforesaid, in the sum of one hundred marks; For the appearance of the said Patrick Gray at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c. "touching a dangerous ryott at the Fortune Playhouse, and callinge to his fellow-saylors to knocke them all downe that were present." S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

¹ *Middx. Co. Rec.* III 161.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 161-2.

⁴ *Ibid.*

18 May 1626. 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J.P., of William Smyth of St Margaret's Westminster yeoman and John Gilbye of Blackwall in Stepney co Midd. purser, in the sum of fifty pounds each, and of Robert Francke of Blackwall aforesaid sailer, in the sum of one hundred marks; For the appearance of the said Robert Francke at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c. "touchinge a daungerous and greate ryott committed in Whitecrossestreete at the Fortune Playhouse, and for givinge out that if they the saylers were not putt in a stronger then the New Prison, they would all be fetched out before the next morowe." S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

18 May 1626. 'Recognizances, taken before George Longe esq. J.P., of Lawrence Davige of St. Andrew's Holborn gentleman and John Kerbye of Blackwall in Stepney victualler, in the sum of five pounds, and of William Collison of Blackwall saylor, in the sum of one hundred marks; For the appearance of the said William Collison at the next S. P. for Middlesex, to answer &c. "concerninge a daungerous and greate ryott committed in Whitecrossestreete at the Fortune Playhouse, and for assaultinge and strikinge of Edward Heather the Headborough." S.P.R., 23 May, 2 Charles I.'

It was at the Fortune theatre that the notorious Dr. Lambe had been seeing a play on the afternoon of Friday, 13 June 1626, before he came out to meet the mob violence which resulted in his death the next morning. Dr. Lambe had brought the fury of the London mob down upon himself by his alleged 'lewd life', his reputation as a conjurer, and most of all by his association with the hated Duke of Buckingham, and his death was widely noted. One of the best accounts is in a letter from Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, 21 June 1626.

On Friday evening, June 13, Dr. Lamb having been at a playhouse, as he was coming thence, some boys and such like began to quarrel with and affront him, calling him the *duke's devil*, and in such sort, that he hired some sailors and others that he gathered up to guard him home. He came in at Moorgate, and the people following him. He supped at a cook's shop, where the people watched him, whilst his guard defended him from their violence. Thence he goes to the Windmill Tavern, in Lothbury, the tumult still increasing. At length, as he came thence, the people set upon him. He flies to another house, where they threw stones, and threatened to pull down the house, unless Lamb were delivered to them. The master of the house, a lawyer, fearing what might ensue, wisely sends for four constables to guard him out of his house. But the rage of the people so much increased (no man can

¹ *Middx. Co. Rec.* ii. 162.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 162-3.

tell why or for what cause) that in the midst of these auxiliaries they struck him down to the ground, giving him divers blows and wounds, and quite beat out one of his eyes. Thus being left half dead, and in such a case, that he never spoke after he was carried to the Compter, in the Poultry (no other house being willing to receive him) where the next morning he ended a wretched life by a miserable and strange dream. Some say, the keeper got above £20 by taking twopence a groat apiece of such as came to see him when he was dead.¹

Though Mead's account does not name the theatre which the doctor had been attending, several of the others do. A letter of 19 June from Sir Francis Nethersole to the Queen of Bohemia says,

On Friday last Dr Lambe, of whom her Majesty has heard so much, being at a play at the Fortune, was espied by certain prentices, who fell upon him at his going home, drove him from three several houses where he took shelter, and so wounded him with clubs and stones, that he died the next day.²

The theatre is also mentioned in the rare *A Briefe Description of the notorious Life of Iohn Lambe otherwise called Doctor Lambe. Together with his Ignominious Death* published at Amsterdam in 1628.

Vpon Friday the 13. of Iune, in the yeare of our Lord 1628. hee went to see a Play at the *Fortune*, where the boyes of the towne, and other vnruly people hauing obserued him present, after the Play was ended, flocked about him, and (after the manner of the common people, who follow a Hubbubb, when it is once a foote) began in a confused manner to assault him, and offer violence. He in affright made toward the Citie as fast as he could out of the fields, and hired a company of Sailors, who were there present to be his guard. But so great was the furie of the people, who pelted him with stones, and other things which came next to hand, that the Sailors (although they did their endeaouour for him) had much adoe to bring him in safetie as farre as Moore-gate.³

That the Fortune theatre was popularly associated with the death of Dr. Lambe at the hands of the mob is attested by stanzas ten and eleven of the ballad, 'The Tragedy of Doctor Lambe'.

10 This man vpon that day,
As it is knowne for certaine,
Went to see a play
At the house cald *Fortune*:
and going away,

¹ Birch, *Charles I*, i. 364-5.

² C.S.P., *Dom.*, 1628-9, p. 169.

³ P. 20 (C₃ v).

II A crew of Sea-men bold,
That went to see the action,
Followed the Doctor old,
And rose vnto a faction,
as 'tis tolde.¹

The play which Dr Lambe saw at the Fortune just before his encounter with the mob was probably one of the productions of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company, though what play we do not know. Indeed, none of the plays in the repertory of this company is known. One would guess that they retained the plays which had been written for the Palsgrave's company after the fire of December 1621 and perhaps some of those which the Lady Elizabeth's company had performed at the Phoenix before 1625, but there is no evidence.

Such actions as those of the mob of May 1626 and of the mob of assailants of Dr. Lambe suggest that the Fortune and its company were not of much repute in these times, a suggestion which might also be derived from the paucity of evidence about the company at the Fortune. Indeed, it seems likely that the reputation for noise and violence and vulgarity which the Fortune had in the later Caroline times was developing during the period when the King and Queen of Bohemia's company occupied the theatre, for this reputation is already in evidence by 1632 when Alexander Gill wrote his sneering verses on Jonson's *Magnetic Lady*

Is this your loade-stone, Ben, that must attract
Applause and laughter att each scaene and acte?
Is this the childe of your bed-ridden witt,
An none but the Blacke-friers foster ytt?
If to the Fortune you had sent your ladye
Mongest prentizes and apell-wyfes, ytt may bee
Your rosie foole might haue some sporte haue gott,
With his strang habitt and indiffinett nott
But when as silkes and plush, and all the witts
Are calde to see, and censure as befitts,
And yff your follye take not, thay, perchance,
Must here them selves stilde, gentle ignorance.
Foh! how ytt stinckes! what generall offence
Giues thy prophanes, and grosse impudence!²

Probably the King and Queen of Bohemia's company was depleted for the formation of the King's Revels company and

¹ *Pepysian Garland*, p. 280.

² Wood's *Athenae*, ii. 598. The play was licensed for production by Herbert on 12 October 1632 (*Herbert*, p. 34). Presumably Gill's verses were written shortly after.

completely destroyed when the new Prince Charles's company was formed.¹ Gunnell was one of the builders, in 1629, of the new Salisbury Court theatre,² where the King's Revels performed, and presumably his interest in the King and Queen of Bohemia's men decreased thereafter.³ Furthermore, William Cartwright of the old company was a member of the new King's Revels, and others may have been.⁴ Mathew Smith was a member of Prince Charles's company by 7 December 1631, and Richard Fowler appears in another list of that company dating not later than December 1631. Andrew Cane, who in April 1624 was one of the signatories of the bond to Gunnell to continue to play at the Fortune and who therefore may possibly have been a member of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company, appears in both the above-mentioned lists of Prince Charles's men. We have already noted that Richard Price was buried 23 July 1627.⁵ Thus all the known members of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company were dead or members of other companies by the end of 1631. It seems probable that the company was extinct by that time.

It is unfortunate that the discussion of this company must be so conjectural. The evidence of its existence, however, can scarcely be doubted, and the conjectures concerning the dates of its activity, its derivation, and its playing place may serve until new evidence provides a few more facts to work with.

¹ See below, pp. 290-1 and 308-9.

² See Adams, pp. 368-75; below, p. 283, n. 7, and 'Players'.

³ Gunnell had evidently ceased to be a patented player of any recognized troupe by January 1631/2, for attached to a petition of that date is a statement by the Lord Chamberlain, 'I vnderstand not Richard Gunnell to bee any of his Mat^{tes} seruantes either in y^e quality of a stage player or otherwise' (*M S C.* 11. 407).

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁵ See 'Players'.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RED BULL-KING'S COMPANY

OUR information about the shadowy group of players who performed at the Red Bull and elsewhere after 1625 is so scanty that only the sketchiest and most tentative account of the organization can be given. There is only one certain list of the members of the troupe, most of whom are quite obscure. There are no plays which we can assign to the repertory of the company with certainty; even the name of the group is problematical.

The best suggestion for the origin of the group of players at the Red Bull is that they were formed of the remnant of Prince Charles's (I) company which remained at the Red Bull after the defection of four of their leading players to the King's company¹ and after the long plague closing of 1625, and that this remnant was joined to a provincial King's troupe to form a new company which was called the Red Bull company in London and the King's company in the provinces. Though this conjecture, which was made by Professor Murray,² is unsatisfactory on several grounds,³ it is the best that has been made; it does account for most of the facts.

The first definite record of the organization is to be found in an entry in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book:

'[Received] from Mr. Hemming, in their company's name, to forbid the playing of Shakespeare's plays, to the Red Bull Company, this 11 of April, 1627,—5*l.* 0. 0.'⁴

¹ See above, pp. 209-10

² Murray, 1. 271.

³ In the first place, none of Prince Charles's men is ever found connected with the later Red Bull company. In the second, our evidence that Prince Charles's company *was* the company at the Red Bull from 1623 to 1625 is very shaky (see above, pp. 205-9). Finally, the evidence that the company called the King's men in the provinces was the same as the one called the Red Bull company in London is inadequate, resting chiefly on the Reading notice of 30 November 1629. I can take no stock in Professor Murray's notion that the connexion of the company with Charles while he was still Prince of Wales and their current status as provincial King's company accounts for their boldness in performing Shakespeare's plays (see below and n. 4).

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 64. This entry—according to Professor Murray—connects the Red Bull players with the King's company as former players of Prince Charles and as present provincial players of the King, since no group without such connexions would have been so bold as to perform plays belonging to the King's company. To me the very mention of Shakespeare casts doubt on this rather far-fetched explanation. If the Red Bull com-

Sir Henry's designation for the company in this entry is the best one we have. The form in which it appears indicates that the players at the Red Bull were not simply a casual group but a real organization. Their theft of Shakespeare's plays implies that their own repertory was inadequate and that they were not a very strong company—an implication which is also to be found in the paucity of references to the troupe.

If we accept Professor Murray's conjecture that the Red Bull company and the provincial King's company were the same, then it was this company which was playing at Ludlow in November 1627 when one of the town sergeants was abused and beaten. A Ludlow record of 22 November 1627 records the deposition of 'Richard Errington, of the City of London, pewterer, aged 1¹¹^e yeares or thereabout, . . . beinge one of the Company of his Majesties players who then were actinge in the said howse, & this deponent takeinge money att the doore'.¹ Errington appears several times as the leader of provincial companies, but we have no evidence which connects him with any London organization.

The actor whose name appears most frequently with the Red Bull company is William Perry, who had had more than ten years' experience as a provincial player before the plague closing of 1625. Under date of 5 September 1629 the following warrant appears in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books:

Perry W^m A Warraunt to sweare William Perry A Groome of
 y^e Chamber in ordinary wthout ffee September 5th.
 1629.²

The reason that Perry was sworn groom is found in an entry in the State Papers two weeks later, on 18 September 1629:

Commission to Wm. Perrey for making up and keeping a company of players, to present all usual stage plays, by the name of His Majesty's servants for the city of York.³

Evidently the company of players for which Perry obtained the commission was the London Red Bull troupe.

pany felt that it had a right to the King's men's plays, why did it limit itself to Shakespeare? It seems to me much more probable that Shakespeare's plays were stolen not because of any justification but simply because the First Folio offered a good-sized repertory of plays at an alluringly small cost.

¹ Murray, ii. 326.

² M.S.C. ii 351.

³ C S.P., Dom., 1629-31, p. 59.

This fact is indicated in a record made at Reading about three months later, 30 November 1629, when the company visited that town.

William Perrye and Richard Weekes, his Majestie's sworne servantes, licensed with the rest of their company, John Kerke, Edward Armiger, Hughe Tatterdell, Deavid[?] Ferris, Robert Hint and George Williams, all of the Red Bull company, by the Master of the Revells, dated the tenth of November, 1629.¹

By November 1629, then, the London Red Bull company and the provincial King's company under the leadership of Perry and Weeks were the same. That they had been amalgamated before this time is only a conjecture, but one which does not do obvious violence to the facts.

The list of players recorded at Reading does not help us as much in tracing the origin and development of the company as could be wished. Of the eight players named, six—John Kirke, Edward Armiger, Hughe Tatterdell, Deavid Ferris, Robert Hint, and George Williams—do not appear in any earlier connexion. Richard Weeks appears only once before when his name is entered in the list of Queen of Bohemia's players to be sworn grooms of the chamber in 1628. He was not sworn, however, for his name was deleted and that of William Rogers substituted. The only well-known player in the list is William Perry, who is found in several earlier provincial lists, twice, it is interesting to note, in lists of companies which had been associated with the Red Bull before 1625.² Three of the players in the Reading list appear neither before nor after this one time.

While the Red Bull company was playing at Reading and presumably elsewhere in the provinces as the King's company, their London theatre was apparently dark, for on at least one occasion it was occupied by another troupe. Between the date that Herbert issued his licence for the company to tour the provinces and their appearance in Reading, a visiting company of French players performed at the Red Bull theatre at least once. The record is to be found in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book:

'For allowinge of the Frenche [company] at the Red Bull for a daye, 22 Novemb. 1629,—[2l. os. od.].'³

¹ Murray, ii. 386.

² See 'Players'.

³ Herbert, p. 59.

Though the French company cannot have played at the Red Bull for long, possibly only this one day,¹ we have no evidence as to when the touring Red Bull players returned to their London theatre. Presumably they did return between tours, but the only traces of the company in the next four years are to be found in the provinces or in provincial permits recorded in London. On 12 November 1630 the clerk at Reading noted:

Memorandum, William Perrey and Richard Wickes, the King's servantes, and their Company were here x dayes past 15^s.²

On 27 February 1632/3 a new warrant for the touring company was entered in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books:

Perry W ^m / Lycence for players	A warr ^t to y ^e signet to draw vp a Bill for the Kinges hand for A lycence vnto William Perry and his Associates to practize the quality of stage playes in y ^e Citty of Yorke & else where w th in his Mat ^{es} dominions Febr 27. 1632 ³
---	--

About three months later the company was at King's Lynn where payment was recorded on 31 May 1633 to 'his Majesties Plaours of his private chamber in Yorke' ⁴ A little later in the year, on 3 July, Perry was at Norwich with a new instrument, and presumably the company was with him, though the Norwich account does not mention the presence of the company or its name.⁵ At an unspecified date before

¹ The only recorded performances we have are those at Blackfriars, 4 November 1629, at the Red Bull, 22 November 1629, and at the Fortune 14 December 1629. Brande says that they were driven from the stage at Blackfriars, and Herbert reduced his fee because of their ill success at the Fortune. Probably they were in London not more than two months. (See *Herbert*, p. 59)

² Murray, II 386.

³ *M.S.C.* II 360. The reference to the city of York, which is repeated in a slightly different form from the commission of 1629, is puzzling. The Reading entry which identifies the provincial King's company with the Red Bull players suggests that 'His Majesty's servants for the city of York' was little more than a name, yet this warrant to the signet uses York in the same way that London is used in other patents and licences. Is it possible that Perry had established some sort of an enterprise in York?

⁴ *Hist. MSS. Com.*, MSS. of King's Lynn, 11th Report, Part 3, p. 178.

⁵ 'This day Willm Perry brought to this Court a Bill signed wth his mat^{ies} hand & privy Signett dated the last day of April in the ninth yeare of his mat^{ies} Reigne confirmed by the Master of the Revels vnder his seale the 24th of May last to play Comedies &c wth a non obstante all restraint to the contrary. There is given vnto them Thre pounds as a gratuity And therevpon the said W^m Perry promised to desist' (Murray, II 354) The entry of this expenditure in the Norwich Chamberlain's accounts three days later

4 December 1633, Perry was paid five shillings at Coventry as 'one of the Kings players that came with a comission'.¹ On 1 March 1633/4 Perry was back at Norwich with his company, where he experienced difficulties with the local authorities. The record of Perry's arrival contains no hint of any difficulty.

This day Willm Perry brought into this Court his Mat^{ies} warrant vnder his hand & privy signett whereby the said W^m Perry & his Company are licenced to play & dated the last of Aprill Anno dm 1633.²

Two weeks later, however, the town authorities felt that the players had titillated the local folk long enough, but they found that Perry and his company did not propose to leave. The Norwich clerk records the disagreement.

March 15.

Willm Perry one of the kings players beinge this day in Court was demanded why hee & his Company did contynue to play in this City beyond the tyme agreed vpon. They sayd they have liberty by their patent to contynue their playes forty dayes And beinge desired to forbear to play any more for the reasons intimated vnto them they havinge nowe stayed fiften dayes to the greate hurt of the poore they would give no answer therevnto but desired eight dayes longer.³

Oddly enough, Perry seems to have bluffed the Norwich authorities, for there is no record of any action taken against him. On the contrary, there are records dated the 19th and 22nd betraying the timidity of the court. The advice of the Lord Bishop was sought as to whether a petition should be sent to the King or an order obtained from the Council. It was decided on the 22nd to petition against the plague of players.⁴

Sometime before July 1634 the Red Bull-King's company was succeeded at the Red Bull by Prince Charles's (II) company and went themselves to the Fortune. The evidence for this change is to be found in Thomas Crosfield's record of what Richard Kendall, a wardrobe keeper for the King's Revels company, told him about the London dramatic companies on 18 July 1634.

indicates that the company still had some sort of patronage from the King: 'Itm paid to Mr Perry one of his Mat^{ies} players as a gratuity for that he did forbear to play in this City, by warrant dated the sixt of July 1633 . . .
iii^{li}' (ibid., p. 372).

¹ Murray, ii. 252.

³ Ibid., p. 355.

² Ibid., p. 354.

⁴ Ibid.

3. The Princes Servants at y^e Red-bull in St Johns street, y^e cheife Mr Cane a goldsmith, Mr Worth Mr Smith 2000¹.
4. The Fortune in Golden Lane, y^e cheife Mr W^m Cartwright, Edward Armestead, John Buckle, John Kirke.¹

We have corroborative evidence that Prince Charles's men had transferred to the Red Bull,² and a Canterbury record of 25 March 1635/6 indicates that the Perry-Weeks company was then at the Fortune.³ It is somewhat disturbing that Kendall's list of the four chief men of the company includes only two, John Kirke and Edward Armestead (assuming that he is to be identified with Edward Armiger), who were mentioned in the list of eight members of the company recorded at Reading in 1629. It is quite possible, however, that Perry and Weeks were more important in the country than in London, and that Buckle and Cartwright had joined the troupe since 1629. Of Buckle nothing else is known except that he lived in the parish of the Red Bull in 1638 and in the parish of the Fortune in 1652.⁴ There were two William Cartwrights who were players, one of whom had been known to the London stage for thirty years and had been associated with the Fortune theatre most of that time. It is, therefore, not surprising to find him associated with another company at that theatre in 1634.

It may be that John Shank, Jr., became associated with the company when the players moved to the Fortune, for the younger Shank is several times connected with the Fortune, and in 1635 he appeared at Norwich with Richard Weeks, a leader of the Red Bull-King's provincial troupe, with the same instrument which had been presented by William Perry at Norwich in 1633.⁵

June 6 [1635].

This day Richard Weeks and John Shanke brought into this Court a Bill signed wth his Ma^{ties} hand and privie signett dated the last day of Aprill in the nyenth yeare of his Ma^{ties} Reigne, and a lyncence vnder the seale of his Ma^{ties} Revells dated the second of March last & contynuinge till the second of September next, They have leaue to play here till the xviiith of this moneth.⁶

During the spring of 1636 the company was on the road and played in Canterbury during Lent. There is no record of their presence in the Canterbury Chamberlain's accounts as

¹ See Appendix, p. 688.

³ See below, p. 276.

⁵ See above, p. 273, n. 5.

² See below, pp. 309-10.

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁶ Murray, ii. 357.

quoted by Professor Murray, but the State Papers contain correspondence between the Mayor and the Privy Council on the subject, a correspondence which suggests that William Perry was continuing his high-handed defiance of local authorities.¹ The company had come to Canterbury about the middle of March 1635/6, for they had played eight days and had departed when the Mayor wrote his letter of complaint on the 25th:

James Nicholson, Mayor of Canterbury, to Archbishop Laud
 Certain stage-players came lately to that city, and in obedience to his Majesty's commission played there eight days, and their night plays continued until midnight, to the great disorder of the city, whereof daily complaints came to the writer. Finding that these plays proved a nursery for drunkenness and disorder, especially in that time of abstinence, he required the players to desist, whereupon one of them told the writer he would play without his leave. Nevertheless they are gone, but intend to return, and it is given out that they intend to complain of the writer. Beseeches the Archbishop's direction.²

Though the company cannot be identified from this letter, nor from the Council's reply commending the Mayor and prohibiting playing in Lent, the third letter in the series makes the identity of the company quite clear and names Perry as the defiant player.

. . . The players complained of are of the company of the Fortune play house, and the principal of them were Weekes and Perry. The latter was the man that most affronted the writer, saying that he would play whether the mayor would or not, and when on complaints of citizens who could not restrain their servants from being at the plays till near midnight, the writer desired Perry to keep better hours or he would acquaint the Lords with their disorder, Perry replied he cared not. It was not a player, but Mr. Moseley, who dwells near Tower Hill, London, who inebriated and abused one of the two maidens, in the play house.³

The Mayor's letters show that the Red Bull-King's company was still occupying the Fortune in London, and that Weeks and Perry were still leaders of the touring company, in spite of the fact that Shank had appeared with Weeks at Norwich nine months before. The night playing was apparently not unusual at Norwich at this time.⁴

Probably the company was back in London before the closing of the theatres for the plague of 1636-7, for Sir Henry

¹ See above, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*, p. 355.

³ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1635-6, p. 321.

⁴ See below, p. 312.

Herbert's office-book records the licensing of a play on 12 May 1636 which seems to have been allowed for the Red Bull company:

'Received of ould Cartwright for allowing the [Fortune] company to add scenes to an ould play, and to give it out for a new one, this 12th of May, 1636,—£1 0 0'¹

I think we are reasonably safe in assuming that this revised play was allowed for the Red Bull-King's company, for they were acting at the Fortune at this time, and Cartwright was a member of the company—or at least he had been two years before, and there is no reason to think that he had left them before May 1636

The company got little immediate gain from their old play disguised as a new one, for on the very day that Sir Henry Herbert allowed it, 12 May 1636, he also sent out his orders to all the theatres to close because of the increase of the plague in London. Except for one week, the theatres remained dark until 2 October 1637.² Such a state of affairs was, of course, disastrous for players, and it must have been particularly serious for an undistinguished troupe like the Red Bull-King's company. Nothing is known of them during the plague period nor for eighteen months afterwards

In 1639 the players were in trouble, as is indicated by a letter of Edmund Rossingham to Viscount Conway, dated 8 May 1639.

. Thursday last [2 May] the players of the Fortune were fined 1,000*l* for setting up an altar, a bason, and two candlesticks, and bowing down before it upon the stage, and although they allege it was an old play revived, and an altar to the heathen gods, yet it was apparent that this play was revived on purpose in contempt of the ceremonies of the Church, if my paper were not at an end I would enlarge myself upon this subject, to show what was said of altars.³

A more circumstantial account of the affair was printed in *Vox Borealis, or The Northern Discoverie*, 'the yeare coming on, 1641':

In the meane time let me tell ye a lamentable Tragedie, acted by the Prelacie, against the poore Players of the *Fortune* Playhouse, which made them sing

Fortune my foe, why dost thou frown on me? &c

¹ Herbert, p. 37.

² See Appendix, pp. 661-5.

³ C.S.P., Dom, 1639, pp. 140-1.

[f]or they having gotten a new old Play, called *The Cardinalls conspiraie*, whom they brought upon the stage in as great state as they could, with *Altars, Images, Crosses, Crucifixes*, and the like, to set forth his pomp and pride. But wofull was the sight to see how in the midst of all their *mirth*, the Pursevants came and seazed upon the poore Cardinall, and all his Consorts, and carryed them away. And when they were questioned for it, in the High Commission Court, they pleaded *Ignorance*, and told the Archbishop, *that they tooke those examples of their Altars, Images, and the like, from Heathen Authors*. This did somewhat assuage his anger, that they did not bring him on the Stage: But yet they were fined for it, and after a *little Imprisonment* gat their liberty. And having nothing left them but a few old Swords and Bucklers, they fell to Act the *Valiant Scot*, which they Played five dayes with great applause, which vext the Bishops worse then the other, insomuch, as they were forbidden Playing it any more; and some of them prohibited ever Playing againe ¹

The episode at the Fortune must have been town talk for a few days, but I know of no other accounts than these. The fine mentioned by Rossingham sounds too large; certainly if the court did impose such a penalty, it is incredible that the Fortune players should have been able to pay it. The details of the story in *Vox Borealis* are made a bit suspicious by the obvious anti-ecclesiastical bias of the writer. If the theatre was actually raided by the 'Pursevants', it is the only example we have of such violence in theatrical affairs before the war. The play named, *The Cardinal's Conspiracy*, is otherwise unknown, though *The Valiant Scot* is extant and may well have been the property of the company. Yet even this title comes a little too pat in the Puritan account. It seems odd that if the aftermath of *The Cardinal's Conspiracy* was as it is represented in *Vox Borealis*, the prohibition of the play and the interdiction of some of the actors should not have been mentioned in Herbert's office-book, and if mentioned should not have attracted Malone's attention. Since we have no contradictory evidence, the Puritan newspaper account of the affair at the Fortune must be accepted, but I am suspicious of its details.

Later in the year the company was probably involved in a complaint by the King's men. The following warrant appears in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books:

¹ HN quarto, B₂-B₂^v. Hotson (pp. 3-4) prints this account verbatim from *A Second Discovery by the Northern Scout*, 1642.

App^hension Another [*warrant*] for Iohn Rodes of y^e fortune Playhouse vpon y^e complaint of the black fryers Company for selling their Playes eod [28 Oct 1639] Ios: Butler messeng^r.¹

Now Rhodes is known from other records to have had an interest in the Fortune theatre, and it is not impossible that he had succeeded Gunnell as manager of that playhouse.² He may have been allowing the Red Bull-King's company to use plays belonging to the King's men, as Heminges complained that they had used Shakespeare's plays in 1627.³

In 1640 the company again exchanged theatres with Prince Charles's men, as they had some time between 1629 and 1634. The first reference to this second exchange of theatres is the direct statement in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book:

'At Easter 1640,⁴ the Princes company went to the Fortune, and the Fortune company to the Red Bull.'⁵

Sir Henry gives no reason for the change, nor does he make any other references to it, but John Tatham wrote a prologue for the company in which the move is quite fully commented upon. Considering the propaganda purpose of most prologues, the pleas and complaints in this one are scarcely to be relied upon as unbiased statements of fact, yet they can be taken as references to events, however prejudiced. We do not know for what play this prologue was written, but it was printed, within a few months of the events referred to, in the 1640 edition of Tatham's *Fancies Theatre*.⁶ The prologue is reprinted in the account of Prince Charles's company below, pp. 315-16.

Evidently the exchange of theatres had been made against the will of the Red Bull-King's company, and they felt aggrieved. They contend that the charges at the Fortune had been so high that the company had been impoverished and then evicted. Obviously there must have been another side to the story, but the complaints are not those which a prosperous company would make; probably the troupe had not been playing to full houses at the Fortune. The spiteful charges of 'dinn and incivility' and vulgarity made against Prince Charles's men are those which one might expect evicted players to make against their successors, yet there

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 391.

² See above, pp. 270-1.

³ *Herbert*, p. 66.

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁵ Easter day fell on 5 April in 1640.

⁶ Entered S.R. 15 October 1640.

are repetitions of these accusations by less biased writers.¹ The allegation that Prince Charles's men had plotted to have their rivals evicted is likely enough to be true, yet it cannot, of course, be accepted at its face value. Finally, the plea to the Red Bull audience to abandon its bad habits of throwing 'Tyle or Peare' in the theatre is not one to be made without reason. If the players felt that they had to make such a plea, they must indeed have thought of their enterprise at the Red Bull as 'this forlorne Hope'.

After the accounts of their move to the Red Bull at Easter 1640, we have no further records of the company in London.² In the absence of evidence it may be assumed that they continued at the Red Bull until the closing of the theatres by act of Parliament in September 1642. In the last years before the war the Red Bull and the Fortune are coupled as the haunts of noise and vulgarity. Gayton says:

I have heard, that the Poets of the Fortune and red Bull, had alwayes a mouth-measure for their Actors (who were terrible teare-throats) and made their lines proportionable to their compasse, which were *sesquipedales*, a foot and a halfe.³

Evidently the Red Bull audience had brought the company down to its level, unless, as one suspects, Tatham's prologue to the contrary notwithstanding, they had descended to that level long since. Though surreptitious acting continued at the Red Bull long after the closing of the theatres by law,⁴ the Commonwealth actors were probably gathered from several London companies. Herbert's laconic statement in his office-book, 'Here ended my allowance of plaies, for the war began in Aug. 1642',⁵ marks the end of a dramatic epoch.

LISTS AND CHARTS

The sources for the various lists of the players of the Red Bull-King's company on p. 281 are as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Murray, II. 326 | 7 Ibid, pp. 354-5 |
| 2 C S P., <i>Dom</i> , 1629-31, p. 59 | 8 Appendix, p. 688. |
| 3 Murray, II. 386. | 9. Murray, II. 357 |
| 4. Ibid | 10. C.S P., <i>Dom.</i> , 1635-6, pp. 321 |
| 5 M.S.C. II. 360. | and 354-5 |
| 6. Murray, II. 354 and 372. | 11. <i>Herbert</i> , p. 37. |

¹ See below and p. 319, and 'Players' Fowler.

² Perry was at Coventry with a troupe—presumably this one—in the year ending 7 December 1642 (Murray, II. 254)

³ See Appendix, p. 690. Similar characterizations of the two theatres are made by others. See below, pp. 319-20

⁴ See Hotson, Chapter I, *passim*.

⁵ *Herbert*, p. 39.

ACTOR LISTS

Actors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Richard Errington	His Majesty's players at Ludlow	Leader of H M players of York	Licensed H M and Red Bull players	Leaders of King's Servants, Reading	Licensed Leader Company of York	Leader H M players, Norwich	Leader H M players, Norwich	Fortune Players, Crosfield's Diary	Leaders at Norwich	Leaders at Canterbury	Licensed Play at Fortune
John Hill	22 Nov. 1627	18 Sept. 1629	10 Nov. 1629	12 Nov 1630	27 Feb 1632/3	3 July 1633	Mar 1633/4	18 July 1634	6 June 1635	Mar 1635/6	May 1636
William Perry	x	x	1	1	x	x	x	4	1	2	x
Richard Weeks	x	x	1	2	x	x	x	2			
John Kirke			2								
Edward Armiger			3								
Hugh Tatterdell			4								
Deavid Ferris			5								
Robert Hunt			6								
George Williams			7								
William Cartwright			8								
John Buckle			9								
John Shank			10								

PROVINCIAL NOTICES¹

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
22 Nov. 1627	Ludlow	Murray, II. 326
30 Nov. 1629	Reading	Ibid., p. 386
1630	Reading	Ibid.
15 July 1632	Doncaster	Ibid., p. 257
1632	Worcester	Ibid., p. 410
3 July 1633	Norwich	Ibid., p. 354
1633	Leicester	Ibid., p. 318
>4 Dec. 1633	Coventry	Ibid., p. 252
1-15 Mar. 1633/4	Norwich	Ibid., pp. 354-5
6 June 1635	Norwich	Ibid., p. 357
1635	Leicester	Ibid., p. 318
June-Sept 1635	Bristol	Ibid., p. 219
24 Apr. 1636	Doncaster	Ibid., p. 257
11 May 1636	Norwich	Ibid., p. 358
>20 Nov 1636	Coventry	Ibid., p. 252
>7 Dec. 1642	Coventry	Ibid., p. 254

RED BULL-KING'S COMPANY REPERTORY

D., J. *The Knave in Grain*, *New Vampt* 1st ed. 1640. The title-page says, 'A witty Comedy, Acted at the *Fortune* many dayes together with great *Applause*'. This play has sometimes been assigned to Prince Charles's company (*Cavalier Drama*, p. 269), apparently because that company is known to have performed at the *Fortune* in 1640 and later. Prince Charles's men did not come to the *Fortune*, however, until Easter 1640, and *The Knave in Grain* was entered in the S.R. 18 June 1639 and transferred 22 October 1639. Evidently the company which had acted it so often was the Red Bull-King's company, more than once called 'the *Fortune* company'.

W., J. *The Valiant Scot*. 1st ed. 1637. No company or theatre is mentioned on the title-page, but *Vox Borealis* says that it was the play which the company produced after being restrained for performing *The Cardinal's Conspiracy*. (See above, pp. 277-8.)

ANONYMOUS. *The Cardinal's Conspiracy*. Not extant. This play is known only from the statement in *Vox Borealis* that it was the play for which the players were called before the Court of High Commission in May 1639. (See above, pp. 277-8.)

¹ One cannot always be sure, of course, whether the London or the provincial King's company is intended in the town records. I have listed here only the records which mention Perry or Weeks or some other clue pointing to the provincial company. All others are listed for the London company on pp. 92-3.

CHAPTER IX

THE KING'S REVELS COMPANY

THERE are far too many uncertainties about this company for comfort. We cannot be certain what type of company it was, when it was organized, or where it performed at all times. The first puzzle is the type of company. The organization is referred to as 'the Children of the Reuells', 'the Company of players of Salisbury Court', 'the Company of the Revells', and 'the Company of His Majesties Revells'. This variety of names, each of which occurs three or four times, would be insignificant were it not for the fact that one title implies a company of children and the others a company of adults. The company can scarcely have been of the old children's type, for at least eleven of the names found in lists of the organization are the names of adults.¹ Yet we cannot ignore the five occasions on which the company is designated Children of the Revels,² Heminges's references to 'pigmeyes',³ or the reference in Brome's *Antipodes* to

a Play,
Compos'd by th' Divell, and acted by the Children
Of his blacke Revells, may hell take yee for't.⁴

The only conclusion I can draw from these facts is that the make-up of this company was similar to that of Beeston's Boys,⁵ a group containing both adults and children, but with a much larger proportion of boys than was customary in men's companies.

As to the date and circumstances of the organization of the King's Revels there is not much more certainty. It has usually been asserted that the company was formed to occupy the new Salisbury Court theatre when it was built in 1629.⁶ There is no doubt that the Salisbury Court was built in 1629,⁷

¹ See the company lists below, p. 297.

² Twice in the Lord Chamberlain's records (*M.S.C.* ii. 375), once by Gresley (see below, n. 7), and twice by Malone from Herbert (*T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923, p. 820). In the latter two references we cannot be sure whether the designation is Malone's or Herbert's

³ See 'Players': Randolph.

⁴ 1640 edition, ii. 5 (E2)

⁵ See below, p. 324, n. 1.

⁶ Fleay, *Stage*, p. 329; Adams, p. 374; Murray, 1 279.

⁷ On 24 June 1629 Sir Henry Compton, Sir John Sackville, and others, in trust for Edward, Earl of Dorset, let a plot of ground in Salisbury Court to Richard Gunnell and William Blagrove. The lease was for a term of

but there is no evidence that the King's Revels company was formed for the new playhouse. Indeed, there is one bit of evidence which implies that the theatre was built for the company. On 24 October 1629 Sir George Gresley wrote to Sir Thomas Puckering concerning the Earl of Dorset's leasing of his house in Salisbury Court, and he concluded with the statement that the stables and outhouses had been leased 'unto the master of the revels, to make a playhouse for the children of the revels'.¹ Gresley is not sufficiently accurate in the rest of his account to make one willing to place much reliance on his implication that the company was in existence before the theatre, yet his evidence is more weighty than any which can be cited to show that the company was organized in order to make use of the theatre.

Apparently, then, the King's Revels company was in existence in the autumn of 1629, how much sooner we do not know.

I think there can be little doubt that the King's Revels company played at Salisbury Court, though their occupancy of this theatre has too often been simply asserted without presentation of the evidence. The evidence is (1) Gresley's assertion that the new playhouse was built for 'the children of the revels'; (2) the payment made to William Blagrave, one of the builders of the new theatre in January 1634/5, 'for himselfe & the rest of his Company for three playes Acted by the Children of the Reuells at Whitehall in Anno 1631',²

forty-one and one-half years, the rent for the first half-year was £25 and for each year thereafter £100. A suit of 1658 says that the dwelling-house and playhouse which Gunnell and Blagrave built on their ground cost £1,000. This same suit shows, by implication, that the original theatre had 'seats and boxes and viewing rooms', that the walls of the theatre were 'built or almost built with brick', and that the dwelling-house built with the theatre seems to have been located behind the upper stage, extending out over the lower stage (Hotson, pp. 100-1, 108-10, and 112-3, *Sh. Soc. Paps.* iv. 89 ff.).

The facts about the new playhouse are also to be found, with some inaccuracies, in a letter which Sir George Gresley wrote to Sir Thomas Puckering. The letter, written from Essex House, 24 October 1629, contains the following passage: 'My Lord of Dorset is become a great husband; for he hath let his house in Salisbury Court unto the queen for the Ambassador Leiger of France, which is daily expected to come over, to he in, and giveth for it £350 by the year, and for the rest of his stables and outhouses towards the water side, he hath let for £1000 fine and £100 by the year rent, unto the master of the revels, to make a playhouse for the children of the revels' (Birch, *Charles I.*, ii. 35).

¹ Gresley's full statement is quoted above, p. 283, n. 7.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 375. The warrant is entered twice.

(3) the title-page of the 1640 edition of Brome's *Sparagus Garden* which carries the statement, 'Acted in the yeare 1635. by the then Company of Revels, at *Salisbury Court*'. The title-page of the 1632 edition of Shirley's *Changes* might be cited as further evidence of the occupancy of Salisbury Court by the King's Revels company, but I think this title-page carries a mistake¹

Our knowledge of the personnel of the King's Revels company is, if possible, even more confused than our other information about the history of the troupe. There are three lists of actors which seem to pertain to this company. Only one list has the name of the company attached to it, and no two lists agree as fully as one could wish. The list which we can attach to the company with greatest certainty is the one probably latest in date—the cast for *Messalina* published in the 1640 edition which names the company of the Revels on the title-page. The actors' names are William Cartwright, senior, Christopher Goad, John Robinson, Samuel Thompson, Richard Johnson, William Hall, John Barrett, Thomas Jordan, and Mathias Morris. The last three are assigned boy's parts.

The second list, and the one apparently earliest in date, does not give the company an official name, but calls them simply 'The Company of Salisbury Court'. This list is recorded in the diary of Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, who had a visit on 18 July 1634 from Richard Kendall, wardrobe-keeper for the company. Kendall told Crosfield of the five London companies, of which the fifth was

The Company of Salisbury Court at y^e further end of fleet street against y^e Conduit. The cheife whereof are 1. Mr. Gunnell a Papist 2. Mr. John Yongue. 3. Edward Gibbs a fencer 4. Timothy Reed 5. Christofer Goad. 6. Sam. Thompson. 7. Mr Staffeild. 8. John Robinson. 9. Courteous Grevill. These are y^e cheife

¹ See below, pp. 304–7. The statement on the title-page of the 1632 quarto is 'A Comedie, As it was presented at the Private House in *Salisbury Court*, by the Company of His Majesties Revels'. This statement must be wrong, since there are several pieces of evidence to prove that the Revels company was not at Salisbury Court in 1632 (the play was not licensed by Sir Henry Herbert until 10 January 1631/2), and the prologue and epilogue of *Changes* are quite appropriate for Prince Charles's company in 1632 but completely inappropriate for the King's Revels in that year. I have therefore followed Professor Adams in assigning the play to Prince Charles's company instead of to the King's Revels (see Adams, pp. 376–8).

whereof 7 are called sharers i.e. such as pay wages to y^e servants & equally share in the over-plus: other servants there are as 2 Close keepers Richard Kendall &c¹
 Anthony Dover

The third list gives neither company name nor theatre name but has been identified as the King's Revels company because nine of the actors in the list appear in either the *Messalina* cast or Kendall's list or both. The list contains the names of twenty-eight actors who were called before the mayor's court when they were visiting Norwich, 10 March 1634/5. The entry in the Mayor's Court Books is as follows:

This day George Stutvile came vp to this Court & did giue a note of the names of the rest of his Company vidz John Yonge Edward May W^m Wilbraham W^m Cartwright sen Willm Cartwright Jun XXofer Goade Timothy Reade Thomas Bourne John Robynson Thomas Lovell Thomas Sands Thomas Jorden Walt^r Willyams John Barret Thomas Loveday John Harris Antony Dover Richard Kendall Roger Tosedall Elis Bedowe, Maivrin [or Marovin], Mistale [or Misdale], John Stretch, Henry ffield George Willans James fferret & Antony Bray, And therevpon they were absolutely forbidden to play any longer in this City.²

At first glance the discrepancies in these lists seem so great as to cast considerable doubt on the identity of the company.³ I think, however, that the chief discrepancies can be accounted for. The most serious one is that between the *Messalina* cast and Kendall's list of the chief actors at Salisbury Court in July 1634. If the two lists represent the same company, why should only three of the eleven men Kendall mentioned have acted in *Messalina*? And why should the cast include six actors not mentioned by Kendall at all?

Of the eleven men in Kendall's list, two would not appear in any casts, for they were not actors but wardrobe-keepers, Richard Kendall and Anthony Dover. A third man, Richard Gunnell, was apparently not an actor but a manager and part-owner of the theatre. Though there are numerous records of this man, there are none which show him performing in plays; he always appears in a business capacity or as a playwright or poet. In January 1631/2 the Lord Chamber-

¹ See Appendix, p. 688. I take it that 'Mr. Staffield' was George Stutvile, who is rather well known as a player at the Salisbury Court and other theatres. No player named Staffield is known.

² Murray, II, 356

³ The lists may be more easily compared in the chart on p. 297.

lain said that he was not even sworn as a player.¹ A fourth man who is in Kendall's list but is omitted in the cast, Edward Gibbs, is called a fencer by Kendall, and a Restoration reference to the man also speaks of him as a fencer. Since there is no record of his part in any play, it may well be that the company expected him to put on fencing exhibitions and not to act.¹ A fifth man on Kendall's list but not in the cast is Timothy Reade. Now Reade is known to have been a clown.¹ Since there is no clown part nor any comic role of any size in *Messalina*,² it is to be expected that Reade's name would be omitted from the cast. There are thus plausible reasons for the omission of five of the eleven men of Kendall's list. The other three omitted are John Young, George Stutville, and Curtis Greville. Since the first is called 'Mr.' in the list, like Gunnell, it may be that he was also a manager rather than an actor. The others may have left the company or had minor roles in *Messalina*—two or three unaccountable omissions are not serious; there is usually that much difference between lists and casts. It should be remembered also that there are eight or nine unassigned roles in *Messalina* which may have been taken by Young, Stutville, and Greville.

The six names found in the cast but not in Kendall's list need give us no pause. Three of them, John Barrett, Thomas Jordan, and Mathias Morris, had boy's parts and would, of course, have been omitted from any list of the chief members of the company. A fourth, William Cartwright, senior, was listed by Kendall as a member of the Fortune company,³ and therefore apparently joined the King's Revels between the date of Kendall's list and the date of the cast. William Hall may have done the same, since he was a Prince Charles's man in 1632.¹ The only other man of the cast not in Kendall's list is Richard Johnson. Since his role in the play is a short one, his rank in the troupe was probably not high, and Kendall may not have considered him sufficiently important to name among the chief actors of the company.

I think we can say, therefore, that in spite of the differences between the list of actors which Kendall gave Crosfield and the cast printed in the 1640 edition of *Messalina*, both may

¹ See 'Players'.

² Probably the roles of the two panders, Hem and Stitch, were intended to be comic, but both parts are quite small, and no actor is named for either.

³ See Appendix, p. 688.

be accepted as rolls of the King's Revels company playing at the Salisbury Court theatre

Does the Norwich list refer to the same company? It has generally been said that it does, because five names—Christopher Goad, John Robinson, William Cartwright, senior, John Barrett, and Thomas Jordan—are found in both this list and the *Messalina* cast. It does not seem likely that all five of these men could have transferred from the King's Revels to another company or vice versa between March 1634/5 and the date of the *Messalina* cast. There is a further indication that the King's Revels company was at Norwich in the similarity between Kendall's list and the Norwich one.¹ These two lists have seven names in common, John Young, Timothy Reade, Christopher Goad, George Stutville, John Robinson, Richard Kendall, and Anthony Dover. Furthermore, John Harris of the Norwich list is said in 1650 to have been, formerly, a player's boy of the company of Revels.² Thus of the seventeen names found in Kendall's list of the company and the *Messalina* cast (eleven in the former and nine in the latter, with three common to both), ten appear in the Norwich list, and one other of the Norwich players was once a boy of the King's Revels company. I think, therefore, it is most likely that the players of the King's Revels were at Norwich.

But I cannot believe that *all* the men in the Norwich list belonged to this company, especially since the company had at least four members—Gunnell, Gibbs, Thompson, and Greville—not appearing at Norwich. Twenty-eight actors' names were recorded at Norwich; surely this is too large a number for a touring company. Such evidence as we have indicates that touring companies were smaller, not larger, than London ones. On 9 April 1624 the touring company of William Perry was specifically limited by the Master of the Revels to a group 'not exceedinge the number of twentie',³ and on 3 September 1635 there was exhibited at Norwich a patent of Sir Henry Herbert's dated 28 November 1634 which limited the company to a group 'not exceedinge the number of ffiftene p[er]sons'.⁴ There is a further suggestion that all

¹ This fact was not available to Fleay, Murray, and Adams, since Kendall's list was not printed until 1925

² See 'Players'.

³ Murray, ii. 272-3. A better transcript is to be found in *Hist. MS. Com., Exeter Records*, pp. 171-2.

⁴ Murray, ii. 357.

the Norwich actors were not King's Revels players in the fact that all known King's Revels men are among the first nineteen of the twenty-eight names in the Norwich list. None of the last nine is known to have been connected with the company at any time. I think it probable, therefore, that the list of players at Norwich contains the names of the actors of two companies—the King's Revels and an unknown troupe.¹

The evidence of the wording of the Norwich documents themselves on this point is contradictory. There are two pertinent records at Norwich; first the record of the decision of the court to call the players in, and second the record of the appearance of the players. The first is dated 7 March 1634/5 and reads:

Yt is thought fitt that vpon Tuesday next in the afternoone the players be gen[er]ally sent for And their names taken to the end that therevpon a certificate may be considered of to be sent to the counsell.²

The second, which is dated three days later, begins, 'This day George Stutvile came vp to this Court & did giue a note of the names of the rest of his Company vidz . . .' and concludes, 'And therevpon they were absolutely forbidden to play any longer in this City'.³ Now the first record, 'the players be gen[er]ally sent for', suggests that more than one group of players was to be summoned, but the second, in the phrase 'the names of the rest of his Company', implies that all the actors belonged to one troupe. My suggestion that the Norwich list includes the actors of two troupes, the King's Revels and another touring company, must rest, therefore, on the large number of names and on the fact that none of the last nine ever appears elsewhere as a member of this company.

These three lists of the players of the King's Revels do not afford us much information about the origin of the company. In the first place, the earliest list must date at least five years after the company began to play at Salisbury Court in 1629.⁴

¹ W. J. Lawrence (*M.L.N.* xxv [1930], 208) first suggested two companies. I can account for Stutvile's apparent supervision of both troupes only by assuming that the players had selected him as their spokesman.

² Murray, ii. 356.

³ Idem.

⁴ Kendall's list and the Norwich record are dated 1634 and 1634/5. The date of the *Messalina* cast depends upon the date of the production of the play, which is uncertain. In his edition of *Messalina* Skemp says that it

In the second, one of the lists seems to contain a number of names of the members of another company. In the third place, a majority of the actors of the company are heard of for the first time when they appear in a King's Revels list.

If we consider only the seventeen actors of Kendall's list and the *Messalina* cast, we find that nine of them have not appeared before in any company—Edward Gibbs, Samuel Thompson, John Robinson, Richard Kendall, Anthony Dover, Richard Johnson, John Barrett, Thomas Jordan, and Mathias Morris. Three had been Queen Henrietta's men—John Young, Timothy Reade, and Christopher Goad. Two players, George Stutville and William Hall, had been Prince Charles's men in 1632, and two others, Richard Gunnell and William Cartwright, senior, had been Palsgrave's men before 1625 and presumably King and Queen of Bohemia's men after that date. Curtis Greville was a King's man as late as 1631. These proportions are not changed if we take into consideration the Norwich list. Eighteen of the twenty-eight men named there do not appear in other King's Revels lists. Of the eighteen, fifteen have no known previous company affiliations; one, William Wilbraham, had been a Queen Henrietta's man; one, Edward May, had been a Prince Charles's man in 1631; one, George Willans or Williams, had been a member of a touring Red Bull company in 1629.¹

From this enumeration it becomes evident that the proportion of previously unknown actors in the King's Revels company is too great to enable us to make any very certain deductions about the origins of the company. Moreover, half the actors whose previous company affiliations are known were evidently not members of the original King's Revels, for they appear in other companies after 1629. In these lists I can find at most only two rather vague suggestions of the origin of the company. First, the appearance of Gunnell and

must have been produced after October 1637 (*Materialien*, xxx 29-30). He relies on Fleay's arguments, which he himself refutes, and on the presence in the cast of Goad, who, he thinks, was a Queen's man until the plague-closing of 1636-7. We know, however, that Goad belonged to the King's Revels in 1634 and 1635. I cannot be very sure of the date of the play, but it must have been produced after July 1634, when William Cartwright, senior, was still acting at the Fortune, and before October 1637, when the King's Revels received four members of Queen Hennetta's company and became the Queen's men. The fact that the *Messalina* of the cast—John Barrett—had a son baptized in November 1637 would lead one to push the date as far back as possible, to the autumn or winter of 1634. See 'Players'.

¹ See 'Players' for the careers of all these men.

Cartwright hints that the King's Revels was derived in part from the King and Queen of Bohemia's company,¹ and second, the number of former Queen's men in these lists,² considered with the fact that others joined in 1637 when the company became Queen Henrietta's³ and with the further fact that William Beeston, son and colleague of the leader of Queen Henrietta's company,⁴ was in 1632 some sort of a partner of William Blagrave, an owner of the Salisbury Court,⁵ seems to point to some relationship between the Queen's company and the King's Revels. What that relationship was we do not know.

After this tedious inquiry into the personnel and origin of the King's Revels, let us turn to the history of the troupe. If the company opened at Salisbury Court in the autumn or winter of 1629,⁶ they did not enjoy the new playhouse for very long. On 17 April 1630 Sir Henry Herbert was ordered to close all the theatres, and they were not allowed to reopen until 12 November 1630.⁷

Though there are no known provincial records for the company during the time the theatres were closed, the players must have travelled, for Malone learned from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book that a play had been acted by them in the summer of 1630. He says,

The Muses' Looking Glass was not printed till 1638 (at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield and Francis Bowman), and the titlepage has only 'by T R.,' without any preface or mention of the theatre where it was acted. But it was acted by the Children of the Revels under the title of the Entertainment in the summer of 1630 and licensed by Sir Henry Herbert, November 25, 1630.⁸

¹ The fact that Prince Charles's company appears to have been derived from the King and Queen of Bohemia's players (see below, pp. 307-9) and that two players who had been Prince Charles's men in 1632—George Stutville and William Hall—appeared as King's Revels players in Kendall's list and the *Messalina* cast is a further hint that there was some connexion between the King's Revels company and the King and Queen of Bohemia's company.

² It is noteworthy that of the nine chief men of the company enumerated by Kendall in 1634, three, John Young, Timothy Reade, and Christopher Goad, were former Queen Henrietta's men.

³ See above, pp. 237-9.

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁵ See *M.S.C.* ii. 375, 408.

⁶ Gunnell and Blagrave signed a lease 6 July 1629. The date of the completion of the theatre is conjectural (Adams, pp. 370 and 374).

⁷ See the Plague Appendix, pp. 657-8.

⁸ Written opposite the account of Randolph in Malone's copy of Langbaine and printed by W. J. Lawrence in *T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923. Mr. Lawrence points out that Malone wrote essentially the same statement on the

We may assume that the players came back to London as soon as they were allowed to perform. The licence of *The Muses' Looking Glass* indicates that they were back by the 25th of November, and another of Randolph's plays was licensed to them on the 26th.

Amintas was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert November 26, 1630. It was acted by the Children of the Revels. See his Office Book.¹

Probably the company returned to the Salisbury Court, for four years later, in January 1634/5, William Blagrave, one of the builders of this theatre, was paid 'for three playes Acted by the Children of the Reuells at Whitehall in Anno 1631'² How long they stayed at the Salisbury Court is not known, but they were certainly gone by December 1631,³ when Prince Charles's men were performing at the theatre.

Where they went we cannot be quite sure⁴ On the strength of the opening lines of the prologue to *Holland's Leaguer*, presented by Prince Charles's men at Salisbury Court in December 1631, it is generally said that the King's Revels went to the Fortune The prologue begins,

Gentle spectators, that with graceful eye
Come to behold the Muses Colonie,
New planted in this soyle, forsooke of late
By the Inhabitants, since made fortunate
By more propitious starres; . . .⁵

Certainly the prologue suggests that the King's Revels had deserted the Salisbury Court theatre for the Fortune and that Prince Charles's men envied them. But I am reluctant to accept this new theatre for the King's Revels company quite so readily as has usually been done. There is no other

flyleaf of his copy of the play 'It was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert under the name of The Entertainment, November 25, 1630, and it appears from his office book that it had been acted in the summer of that year' Evidently there is no error in the record of performance before licensing Mr. Lawrence indicates the obvious explanation that the Children of the Revels were touring in plague time and used this play. They licensed it two weeks after the theatres were opened.

¹ Also from Malone's notes in his Langbaine, printed by W. J. Lawrence in *T L S.*, 29 November 1923 I think it probable that Randolph was the regular poet for the King's Revels company in 1629 and 1630, possibly under contract as Brome was at this theatre later See 'Players'. Randolph.

² *M S.C.* ii. 375.

³ See below, Prince Charles's company, pp. 304-7.

⁴ Fleay's attempt (*Stage*, pp. 330-1) to prove that the mysterious group of players arrested at Banbury in 1633 was the King's Revels is entertaining but hardly credible See 'Players'. Bartholomew Jones

⁵ See below, pp. 306-7, for the entire prologue.

evidence that the company went to the Fortune, and, so far as we know, the Salisbury Court and not the Fortune was the superior theatre. Since, however, this prologue is the only available evidence, we must assume that the King's Revels company did transfer to the Fortune before December 1631.

If so, it must have been the King's Revels who produced William Heminges's play, to which Malone found a reference in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book.

Soon after his father's death he [William Heminges] commenced a dramattick poet, having produced in March, 1632-3, a comedy entitled *The Course of a Hare, or the Madcapp*, which was performed at the Fortune theatre, but is now lost MS Herbert ¹

Some time before July 1634,² the King's Revels must have moved back to the Salisbury Court, for they are called the Company of Salisbury Court by Richard Kendall in his account of the company which we have already noticed ³ In addition to his enumeration of the personnel of the company, Kendall told his host of one incident of the tour and of their financial arrangements for playing in Oxford.

... A Crosse [?] mischance happened to this company because of a boy y^t quarrelled with a Scholar in y^e Taverne / They came furnished with 14 playes. And lodged at y^e Kings Armes, where Franklin hath about 3¹¹ a day while they stay, 1 e. for every play 4 nobles besides y^e benefit of seats.⁴

Kendall's note on the repertory of a touring company is most interesting, though it is a pity he did not name the plays. The total repertory which we can assign the company now is less than fourteen plays.⁵ Kendall said that seven of the eleven players he named were sharers, and one would assume that he meant the first seven, though this cannot be taken for granted.

Shortly after their appearance at Oxford the company must have returned to London, for less than a month after Kendall's visit to Crosfield, Sir Henry Herbert licensed 'An

¹ *Herbert*, p. 34.

² Fleay asserts without evidence (*Stage*, p. 330) that when Prince Charles's men accompanied the King to Scotland in May 1633 the King's Revels company returned to the Salisbury Court, which the Prince's men had deserted. I do not think Prince Charles's men went to Scotland with the King (see below, pp. 310-11), but if they did and if Fleay's conjecture is sound, it was probably the King's Revels who had trouble with the second part of *The City Shuffler* in October 1633 (*Herbert*, p. 20).

³ See above, pp. 285-6.

⁴ See Appendix, pp. 688-9.

⁵ See below, pp. 300-1.

ould play, with some new scenes, Doctor Lambe and the Witches, to Salisbury Court, the 16th August, 1634.—
£1 0. 0.¹ In November they produced *The Proxy, or Love's Aftergame*.²

The King's Revels must have been in difficulties in February 1634/5, for though there is no record of their punishment, Sir Henry Herbert took action against one whom he must have considered their accomplice. His office-book records,

'I committed Cromes, a broker in Longe Lane, the 16 of Februe 1634, to the Marshalsey, for lending a church-robe with the name of Jesus upon it, to the players in Salisbury Court, to present a Flamen, a priest of the heathens. Upon his petition of submission, and acknowledgment of his faulte, I releasd him, the 17 Februe 1634.'³

It is unlikely that Herbert would have dealt so severely with Cromes without making the players feel his power, but this is the only record of the affair of the impudent Flamen. Perhaps the presence of the company at Norwich some three weeks after this time indicates some London prohibition.

At any rate, on 7 March 1634/5, the clerk made the entries in the Mayor's Court Books which we have already noticed.⁴ Though the Norwich records do not give the name of the company, I think, for the reasons indicated above, that the twenty-eight players named in the record comprised a touring King's Revels company and another unknown troupe.

The wording of the entries at Norwich makes it evident that the players had been there several days before their names were recorded and implies that there had been trouble of some sort. Can it be that the King's Revels and some provincial company were at Norwich at the same time and that trouble developed between them? There are not enough familiar actors (other than Revels players) in the list to suggest another London company, and the fact that ten of the names are found in association with no other company at all suggests provincial players. The list is puzzling.

¹ *Herbert*, p. 36. It seems probable that this play was patched up to exploit the London interest in witches following the Pendle Forest witch scare and that the company hoped to compete with the play of the King's men on the subject (see above, pp. 40-2).

² *'The Proxy, or Love's Aftergame'*, was produced at the theatre at Salisbury Court, November 24, 1634' (*Herbert*, p. 36).

³ *Herbert*, p. 64.

⁴ See above, pp. 286 and 288-9.

It was probably in 1634 or 1635 that Richard Heton succeeded Richard Gunnell as manager of the Salisbury Court, for twenty years later Andrew Cane said that Gunnell had died in 1634,¹ and in 1636/7 Heton was paid for plays given by the company in October 1635.² If Heton's instructions for his patent³ are any indication of his character, the company must have had a turbulent existence under the domineering manager.

It was probably Heton who induced Richard Brome to leave the company at the Red Bull and become the chief poet for the King's Revels company about this time. On 20 July 1635 Brome signed a contract to give his exclusive services to the Salisbury Court for three years. He agreed to write three plays a year for the theatre as well as songs, prologues, epilogues, and revised scenes for old plays. He was to publish none of his own plays without the consent of the company. For these services he was to receive fifteen shillings a week plus the first day's profits from each new play as a benefit,⁴ which benefit, on one occasion at least, was estimated at five pounds or upwards.⁵

Sometime in 1635 the King's Revels played Brome's *Sparagus Garden* at the Salisbury Court, for the 1640 quarto of that play says, 'Acted in the yeare 1635. by the then Company of Revels, at *Salisbury Court*'. The play was so popular that the profits of the company were estimated to be £1,000.⁶ Since Brome's contract called for three plays a year for the Salisbury Court, he probably wrote one or two others for the King's Revels company, but only *The Sparagus Garden* and *The Queen and the Concubine* can now be assigned to them.

¹ See 'Players'.

² *M S C* ii 381-2.

³ See Appendix, pp. 684-7.

⁴ According to Malone's observations from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, this arrangement was contrary to the general practice of the time, poets generally had their benefit on the second day (*Herbert*, p. 67).

⁵ Andrews, *Brome*, pp. 13-15. Evidently Brome's contract was with the manager and owners of the Salisbury Court theatre and not with the company, for Brome continued at the Salisbury Court after the King's Revels had left, and the notes of the contract which Professor Wallace furnished do not mention the company. It may also be noted that Brome is said to have written only six of the nine plays called for by the three years contract and to have violated the contract by writing two or three plays for the Cockpit between 1635 and 1638.

⁶ Professor C. W. Wallace furnished this information (*Andrews, Brome*, p. 14), apparently from a lawsuit between Brome and the proprietors of the Salisbury Court. The £1,000 profit sounds like the excessive claims of a lawsuit, though the sum is not so great as that which the King's men were rumoured to have taken on *A Game at Chess* (see above, p. 10).

The company had the distinction of being called to court in October 1635 and again in February 1635/6.¹ The name of one of their plays at court in 1635 is indicated by Sir Henry Herbert '*Loves Aftergame*, played at St James by the Salisbury Court players, the 24 of Feb 1635'²

This court performance is our last record of the King's Revels. In May 1636 the plague deaths began to increase alarmingly, and on the 12th Sir Henry Herbert sent the Privy Council's closing order to all the theatres³ Except for one short interval from 24 February to 1 March 1636/7, they remained closed until October 1637. What happened to the company during this long period of restraint we do not know, but when the theatres were opened, four of the broken Queen Henrietta's men came to the Salisbury Court and were joined, as Sir Henry Herbert says, 'with the best of that company'⁴ Since Sir Henry mentions only four Queen's men in the new organization, it is probable that the Queen Henrietta's company which played at Salisbury Court theatre 1637-42 contained most of the old King's Revels company. Certainly there are no records of a London King's Revels after the plague of 1636-7, and I think we may take it for granted that none existed

¹ On 18 February 1636/7, Richard Heton was paid £50 'for himselfe and the rest of y^e company of y^e Players at Salisbury Court for 3 playes Acted by them before his Ma^{ty} in Octob & Feb. 1635. . . .' (*M.S.C.* ii. 381-2)

² *Herbert*, p 56

³ See Appendix, p 661.

⁴ See above, p 237.

ACTOR LISTS

<i>Actors</i>	<i>Crosfield's Diary 18 July 1634^a</i>	<i>Messalina Cast c 1634^c</i>	<i>Norwich List March 1634/5^d</i>
Richard Gunnell	1 (Mr) ^b	.	..
John Young	2 (Mr)		2
Edward Gibbs	3		..
Timothy Reade	4	.	8
Christopher Goad	5	Silius	7
Samuel Thompson	6	Menester	..
George Stutville	7 (Mr)		1
John Robinson	8	Saufellus	10
Curtis Greville	9	.	..
Richard Kendall	Cl. Keeper		19
Anthony Dover	Cl. Keeper		18
Wm Cartwright Sr.	.	Claudius	5
Richard Johnson	..	Montanus	.
William Hall		Mela	..
John Barrett	.	Messalina	15
Thomas Jordan		Lepida	13
Mathias Morris		Sylana	..
Edward May	.		3
William Wilbraham			4
Wm Cartwright Jr.		..	6
Thomas Bourne	.	..	9
Thomas Lovell		.	11
Thomas Sands		.	12
Walter Williams		.	14
Thomas Loveday		..	16
John Harris		..	17
Roger Tosedale		.	20
Ellis Bedowe		.	21
— Maivrin	.		22
— Mistale	.	.	23
John Stretch			24
Henry Field	.		25
George Williams	.	..	26
James Ferret	..	.	27
Anthony Bray	..	.	28

^a See Appendix, p 688. All three lists are discussed above, pp 285-91.

^b Kendall told Crosfield that seven of the eleven men he mentioned were sharers in the company. Presumably they were the first seven named.

^c Published in the first edition of the play, 1640, Br. On the date, see above, p. 289, n 4.

^d Murray, II. 356. For a discussion of this list, see above, pp. 286 ff.

PROVINCIAL NOTICES¹

<i>Date</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
1626, Dec 21	'Paid to the Revels . . . ^{11s} '	Coventry	p 250 ²
1627, July 8	'Item geuen to a Companie of Players, called the Children of the Revells, . . . ^{xiii^s iiii^d} '	Leicester	p 317
1627, < July 8	'Item geuen to a Companie of Players, called the Children of the Reuells . . . ^{x^s} '	Leicester	p 317
1628, Apr.	'Paid & given to the Kings Revells, to Nicholas Hanson one of that company, in April last . . . ^{vs} '	Coventry	p 250
1628	'Item geuen to a greate Companie of Players called the Cheefe Reuells, . . . ^{li^s x^s} '	Leicester	p 317
1630	'Item geuen to a Companie of Players, called the Revells . . . ^{li^s} '	Leicester	p. 318
1630, Nov. 12	'Memorandum, Robert Kimpton, Nathaniell Clay, Thomas Holman, and others named in the licence from the Master of Revells, dated the 30 th of December 1629, tendred themselves to play in Towne, but did not, and were here in Lent last . . . ^{5^s} '	Reading	p. 386
1631, Sept 23	'Paid given to Robert Knippton & John Carr players of the Revells . . . ^{vs} '	Coventry	p 251
1631, Dec. 20	'Paid to the players of the Revells . . . ^{vs} '	Coventry	p 252
1632, Sept 8	'This day Robt Kempston and other of his Company of the Revells vpon their shewing of the lycence of the Maister of the Revells are lycenced to play in this city by the space of two dayes'	Norwich	p 354
1634/5	'Itm to Wm Danyell to spend that hee & his Company should forbear playing of Comedies . . . ^{x^s} '	Norwich	p. 372
1634/5, Mar. 10	[This item is printed above, p. 286.]	Norwich	p. 356
1635, June 16	'Paid given to William Daniell who brought a commission for the Revels vizt, for himself & 16 more . . . ^{x^s} '	Coventry	p. 252

¹ It is obviously impossible that all these notices should pertain to the King's Revels company which played at the Salisbury Court and the Fortune, 1629-36. Professor Murray would assign most of them to three different provincial Revels companies (Murray, II. 8-9 and 10-14). Though I cannot be quite so sure as Professor Murray is of the distinctness of the provincial troupes, neither can I be sure when the London company is in evidence, except in the long Norwich list of March 1634/5.

Because of this great uncertainty, I have thought it best to include all records of Revels players in the reign of Charles I and all records naming players who are elsewhere associated with Revels companies. I have further departed from my usual type of provincial list and given quotations from the provincial records to afford all possible clues for the identification of the company.

² All page references are to Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, vol. II.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
1635, Sept. 3	'A Patent vnder the hand & seale of Sr Henry Herbert Master of the Revels bearinge date the 28 th of November 1634 made to Willm Danyell Willm Hart John Townesend Samuell Mimion Hugh Haughton Thomas Doughton and the rest of their Company not exceedinge the number of fiftene psons to play Comedies &c was this day brought & shewed by the said Willm Daniell who prayed leave to play in this City, But his sute beinge not granted he had in lieu thereof a gratuity of tenn shillings'	Norwich	p. 357
1636, Apr. 22	'Paid given to Richard Drington & William Daniel players of the Revels . . . xxiis'	Coventry	p. 252
1636, Apr. 22	'Itm given to a Companye of Players, called the Kings Revels . . . li'	Leicester	p. 319
1636, Sept. 29- 28 Sept 1637	'Item payd vnto Willham Daniell one of the Kings Revels because he should not playe being in the contagious tyme . . . i 6 8'	Gloucester	p. 285
1637	'Itm given to a Companye of Players, being the Kings Revels . . . li'	Leicester	p. 319
1637 (later)	'Itm given to the Children of the Revels by M ^r Maior's appointment . . . viis'	Leicester	p. 319
1637, Dec. 5	'Paid to Willham Daniell and other of the Revels . . . xs'	Coventry	p. 253
1639	'Imprimis, given to the Children of the Revels . . . iiii ^s '	Leicester	p. 319

KING'S REVELS PLAYS AT COURT

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
1631	3 ^a	£30	24 and 30 Jan. 1634/5 ^b	M S C. ii. 375
Oct. 1635- Feb. 1635/6	3	£50	18 Feb 1636/7 ^c	M S.C. ii. 381-2
24 Feb. 1635/6	<i>Love's Aftergame</i> ^d	<i>Herbert</i> , p. 56

^a Professor Lawrence (*T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923) thinks that *Amyntas* may have been one of these three plays, since it was licensed 26 November 1630, acted by the King's Revels company, and printed with a title-page saying it had been given before the King and Queen at Whitehall.

^b Blagrove was payee. The warrant appears to have been entered twice by mistake.

^c Richard Heton was payee.

^d Probably *Love's Aftergame* was one of the plays for which Heton was paid 18 February 1636/7.

REPERTORY OF THE KING'S REVELS COMPANY

BROME, RICHARD.¹ *The Queen and Concubine* 1st ed 1659 in *Five New Plays* The evidence that the play was performed by the King's Revels company is to be found in the statement of Andrea at the end of v 7

Come then, let's away.

No longer Brothers of the Bench wee'l be,

But of the Revels for his Majesty.

Though the remark fits the situation well enough, the suggestion of the King's Revels company seems too pat to be accidental.

— *The Sparagus Garden*. 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'Acted in the yeare 1635 by the then Company of Revels, at Salisbury Court'

GLAPTHORNE, HENRY *The Lady Mother* 1st ed 1883 (Bullen, *Old Plays*). The MS of the play (B M MS Egerton 1994), folio 210^a, bears the licence. 'This Play Call'd the Lady-moth[er] (the Reformacōns obseru'd) may b[e] Acted October the xvth. 1635 Will. Blagraue dep^t to the m[aster] of the Reuell[s]' (Greg, *Dram Doc*, p. 305) The reference to the Salisbury Court (folio 192^a), 'Now on my life this boy does sing as like the boy at the whitefryers as ever I heard', probably indicates that the play was acted at that theatre, which was occupied by the King's Revels in 1635 The fact that the play was licensed by Blgrave, one of the builders of the theatre and payee for the company in January 1634/5, also suggests the King's Revels.

RANDOLPH, THOMAS *Amyntas*. 1st ed 1638 in *Poems with the the Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*. Professor W J Lawrence (*T.L.S.*, 29 November 1923) quoted a MS note of Malone's as follows. '*Amintas* was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert November 26, 1630. It was acted by the Children of the Revels. See his Office Book' Lawrence points out that probably the play was first produced while the company was touring because of plague in London, and licensed as soon as the theatres were opened in November. The play may well be one of the three presented by the company at court in 1631 for which Blgrave was paid £30 on 24 January 1634/5.

¹ Since Brome signed a contract in July 1635 to write three plays a year for three years for the Salisbury Court (see above, p. 295), it is likely that certain of his unassigned plays were written for this company. I doubt, however, if he wrote more than one or two plays besides *The Queen and Concubine* and *The Sparagus Garden* for the King's Revels, for the theatres were closed about ten months after he signed his contract, and that company did not play at the Salisbury Court thereafter.

- *The Muses' Looking Glass* 1st ed 1638 in *Poems with the Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas* Professor Lawrence (T L S, 29 November 1923, p 820) quotes a MS. note of Malone as follows 'The Muses' Looking Glass was not printed till 1638 (at Oxford by Leonard Lichfield and Francis Bowman), and the titlepage has only "by T R," without any preface or mention of the theatre where it was acted But it was acted by the Children of the Revels under the title of the Entertainment in the summer of 1630 and licensed by Sir Henry Herbert, November 25, 1630' This entry was made in Malone's copy of Langbaine, the following was made in his copy of the play 'It was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert under the name of The Entertainment, November 25, 1630, and it appears from his office book that it had been acted in the summer of that year'
- RAWLINS, THOMAS *The Rebellion* 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'As it was acted nine dayes together, and divers times since with good applause, by his Majesties Company of Revells'
- RICHARDS, NATHAN *Messalina*. 1st ed. 1640; the title-page says, 'As it hath beene Acted With generall applause divers times, by the Company of his Majesties Revells'
- SHIRLEY, JAMES *Changes* Probably not a King's Revels play in spite of the title-page See below, pp 304-7
- ANONYMOUS *The Costly Whore* See above, repertory of Red Bull Revels company, p 174.
- *Doctor Lambe and the Witches*. Not extant 'An ould play, with some new scenes, Doctor Lambe and the Witches, to Salisbury Court, the 16th August, 1634, — £1.0 0' (Herbert, p 36.)
- *Sir Giles Goosecap*. 1st ed 1606, the title-page says, 'A Comedie presented by the Chil of the Chappell'. 2nd ed 1636, the title-page says, 'A Comedy lately Acted with great applause at the private House in Salisbury Court'.
- *The Proxy, or Love's Aftergame*. Not extant 'The Proxy, or Love's Aftergame, was produced at the theatre at Salisbury Court, November 24, 1634.' (Herbert, p. 36.) 'Loves Aftergame, played at St James by the Salisbury Court players, the 24 of Feb 1635[6].' (Ibid., p. 56)

CHAPTER X

PRINCE CHARLES'S (II) COMPANY

THE first notice we have of a company under the patronage of the infant Prince Charles occurs in an entry which I have found in the Signet Office Docquet Book at the Public Record Office. The entry is dated December 1631 and reads as follows:

A lycence vnto Andrew Kayne And others by the name of Seruants to the Prince to exercise and practise all manner of plaies in their new playhowse in Salisbury Court (and not else where wthin the Citties of London or Westm^{er} or the Suburbs thereof or wthin 5 miles Compasse of the same) and also in any other Cittie or borough wthin his Ma^{ty}s dominions or in any place heretofore vsed for that purpose Signified and p[ro]cur by the Lord Visc^{ount} Dorchest^{er}¹

There are several other references to this licence. In 1856 Edward F. Rimbault wrote of several documents concerning the Salisbury Court theatre which 'the late Mr. Thomas Rodd had in his possession'. One of these documents was a 'Grant of permission to Andrew Rayne [obviously a mis-reading of Andrew Kayne] and others, the qualities of Playing as well in their present Theatre, Salisbury Court, as elsewhere, 1631'.² More precise references to the licence are to be found in the Norwich Court books, under date of 3 November 1635:

This day Joseph Moore brought an Instrument signed by his Ma^{ty}e & vnder his Ma^{ties} privie signett authorisinge Andrew Kayne Elis Worth & others to play Comedies in Salisbury Court & otherwhere wthin five miles of London And in all other cities &c³ In the same records there is another account of this licence under date of 9 March 1635/6 which gives its date:

A licence signed by his Ma^{ty}e & vnder his privie signet was this day shewed in Court whereby lycence is given to Andrew Kayne to play Comedyes Test 7^o Decembris Anno Septimo Caroli Regis.⁴ A third entry two years later gives a slightly different list of names. Under the date of 21 February 1637/8 the clerk again referred to the licence.

This day was shewed in Court a warrant signed with his Ma^{ties} hand and privy signet authorizing Joseph Moore Elias Worth

¹ P.R.O. 2/90, C 82/2077.

² *N & Q*, Series II, ii. 145.

³ Murray, ii. 358.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Mathew Smyth & others to play Comedies &c vii Decembr Anno vii Caroli. They had as gratuity of iii^l and soe they willingly departed ¹

Any possible doubt that the Norwich records refer to the Prince's company is set at rest by the entry in the Chamberlain's accounts at Norwich for the gratuity of three pounds given to Moore, Worth, and Smith in 1637/8

Item into the Court of Maioralty to be put into the [account] as soe much given to the Prynces Players iii^l ²

Other early records of the company are (1) Malone's statement derived from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book.

The play of *Holland's Leaguer* was acted six days successively at Salisbury Court, in December, 1631, and yet Sir Henry Herbert received on account of the six representations but *one pound nineteen shillings*, in virtue of the *ninth* share which he possessed as one of the proprietors of that house ³

(2) The statement on the title-page of *Holland's Leaguer*, which was entered in the Stationer's Register 26 January 1631/2⁴ and printed in 1632: 'An Excellent Comedy As It Hath Bin Latelly and often Acted with great applause, by the high and mighty Prince Charles his Servants; at the private house in *Salisbury Court*.' The dramatis personae of this play (A 4) names sixteen actors of the company.

(3) The statement in Heton's instructions for his patent: 'And whereas my lo: of Dorsett had gotten for a former Company of Salisberry Co't the Princes service. . . .'⁵

(4) The undated warrant in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book which comes between warrants of 10 May 1632 and 15 May 1632 and therefore presumably dates between the tenth and fifteenth.

Princes players A warraunt to sweare these seuerall persons following groomes of the Chamber in ordinary wthout ffee to attend the Prince his Highnes in y^e quality of players. vizt.

Ells Worth	Thomas Plumfield	} The Princes Players ⁶
Andrew Kayne	Thomas Bond	
Mathew Smith	Henry Gradwell	
Richard Fowler	& William Hall	
William Browne	George Stutville	
James Sneller		

¹ Murray, II 358. The document shown at Norwich was evidently the one to which Sir Henry Herbert referred in his breuiat for his suit against Davenant in 1660, 'The like Grant made by King Charles first, 7 yeare of His Reigne, To Andrew Caue [Cane] &c. with the like Prouiso' (*Herbert*, p. 105)

² Murray, II 372.

³ *Herbert*, p. 45

⁴ Arber, IV, 236.

⁵ See Appendix, p. 684.

⁶ *M.S.C.* II. 358.

These early records of Prince Charles's men are here strictly enumerated because there has been great confusion about the appearance of the company at Salisbury Court. With these records it seems to me that we can be reasonably sure of certain events. We have testimony from three independent sources that the company was licensed in 1631, two sources give the date as December 1631, and one twice gives the date as 7 December 1631. These three independent sources all testify that the company of Prince Charles's men was playing at Salisbury Court in December 1631, a fact which is corroborated by the record from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book in conjunction with the title-page of *Holland's Leaguer*. The company must have been playing at Salisbury Court before 7 December, for the licence of that date names the theatre they are occupying. Their occupancy of the theatre before the licence was issued is also implied in Heton's statement that Dorset got the Prince's service for the Salisbury Court players. We know from other sources¹ that Dorset was interested in the theatre which was built on his land, and it is likely enough that he used his court position² to improve the status of the tenants of the theatre and thus ensure his rents. If the stages of the licence for the Prince's men were as protracted as most, the company was probably playing at the theatre and waiting for the licence for several weeks before 7 December 1631.

The presence of Prince Charles's company at the Salisbury Court theatre at least as early as 7 December 1631 has not usually been recognized because of the contradictory evidence of the title-page of Shirley's *Changes*. This play was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert 10 January 1631/2, entered in the Stationers' Register 9 February 1631/2, and published in 1632 with the statement on the title-page, 'As it was presented at the Private House in *Salisbury Court*, by the Company of His Majesties Revels'.

Evidently there is a contradiction here. Both Prince Charles's company and the King's Revels cannot have been at the Salisbury Court in January 1631/2. Either there is a mistake in the records or else the King's Revels left the Salisbury Court to Prince Charles's men before December 1631, came back again in January 1631/2, and presumably

¹ See 'Players': Dorset.

² Dorset was Lord Chamberlain to the Queen, and his lady was governess to the Prince.

left a second time in 1632, for the title-page of *Holland's Leaguer* implies that in 1632 Prince Charles's men were still occupying the Salisbury Court. This hypothesis involves too much moving. Let us turn to the alternative of a mistake in the record.

There can be no mistake in the licence, for we have the same fact—that the Prince's men were playing at the Salisbury Court theatre in December 1631—from too many different sources. Is there a mistake in the title-page of Shirley's *Changes*? Professor J. Q. Adams thinks there is,¹ and his reasons seem convincing to me. He suggests that the title-page of *Changes* is correct in all but the name of the company and that the play was really acted by Prince Charles's men.² The prologue and epilogue to this play both refer to the newness of the company, to its new poets, and to its ill success. Both beg the audience to encourage the company's beginning. Now the licences show that Prince Charles's company was new at this time, but we know that the King's Revels was not. The receipts noted in Herbert's office-book demonstrate that Prince Charles's company was faring badly, but apparently the King's Revels was not. Moreover, the prologue and epilogue to *Changes* have the same tone, and touch on much the same subjects as the prologue to *Holland's Leaguer*, a play undoubtedly produced by Prince Charles's company. It seems to me that a comparison of these prologues and epilogues in the light of the other evidence can leave little doubt that Shirley's play was performed by Prince Charles's men and not by the King's Revels. The prologue and epilogue to *Changes* and the prologue to *Holland's Leaguer* follow:

Prologus. [Changes]

*That Muse whose Song within another Spheare³
Hath pleased some, and of the best, whose eare
Is able to distinguish straines that are
Cleare, and Phebean, from the popular;*

¹ Adams, pp. 374–8.

² Evidently there is no mistake in the name of the theatre (though Professor Adams does not consider this possibility), for we have corroboration of the place of performance indicated on the title-page. Shirley reprinted the prologue which he wrote for the play in his *Poems*, 1646. Here it is entitled, '*A Prologue to his Comedy of the Changes, or Love in a Maze: First Acted at Salisbury Court*' (p. 151 [D3]).

³ Shirley, the author of the play, had been writing for Queen Henrietta's men at the Phoenix.

*And sinfull dregs of the adulterate braine,
 By mee salutes your Candor once againe;
 And begs this noble favour, that this place,
 And weake performances may not disgrace
 His fresh Thalia, 'las our Poet knowes
 Wee have no name, a torrent overflowes
 Our little Iland, miserable wee,
 Doe every day play our owne Tragedy.
 But 'tis more noble to create than kill,
 Hee saies, and if but with his flame, your will
 Would joyne, wee may obtaine some warmth, and prove
 Next them that now doe surfeit with your love.
 Encourage our beginning, nothing grew
 Famous at first, and Gentlemen, if you
 Smile on this barren Mountaine, soone it will,
 Become both fruitfull and the Muses hill¹*

Epilogus [Changes]

*OVr Poet knowes you will be just, but we
 Appeale to mercy, he desires that yee
 Would not distaste his Muse, because of late
 Transplanted, which would grow here, if no fate
 Have an unlucky bode opinion
 Comes hither but on crutches yet, the Sun
 Hath lent no beame to warme us, if this Play
 Proceed more fortunate, wee shall blesse the day,
 And love that brought you hither; tis in you
 To make a little sprigge of Laurel grow,
 And spread into a grove, where you may sit,
 And heare soft stories, when by blasting it,
 You gaine no honour, though our ruines lye
 To tell the spoiles of your offended eye:
 If not for what we are, for alas here
 No Roscious moves to charme your eyes, or eare,
 Yet as you hope hereafter to see Playes,
 Encourage us and give our Poet bayes.²*

Prologue. [Holland's Leaguer]

*Gentle spectators, that with gracefull eye
 Come to behold the Muses Colonie,
 New planted in this soyle, forsooke of late
 By the Inhabitants, since made fortunate³*

¹ *Changes*, 1632 quarto, A₄.

² *Ibid*, L₁^v. This prologue and epilogue, both of which Shirley reprinted in his *Poems*, 1646, imply that he intended to remain with the Salisbury Court company.

³ Presumably the King's Revels company, which had left the Salisbury Court for the Fortune.

*By more propitious starres; though on each hand
 To over-top us, two great Lawrels stand,
 The one, when she shall please to spread her traine,
 The vastnesse of the Globe cannot containe;
 Th'other so high, the Phoenix does aspire
 To build in, and takes new life from the fire
 Bright Poesie creates,¹ yet we partake
 The Influence they boast of, which does make
 Our Bayes to flourish, and the leaves to spring,
 That on our branches now new Poets sing,
 And when with ioy hee shall see this resort,
 Phoebus shall not disdain to stile't his Court²*

I think we can conclude that Prince Charles's company came to the Salisbury Court not long before 7 December 1631, though they did not become Prince Charles's servants until after they had begun to play in the Salisbury Court. Apparently they succeeded the King's Revels company which had gone to the Fortune. How long Prince Charles's men stayed at the Salisbury Court we do not know, but they were certainly gone by July 1634.³

Can we tell anything about the antecedents of Prince Charles's company from the early lists of the actors of the organization? We have five lists, or partial lists, of these players in the years 1631 and 1632.⁴ The first two lists are those mentioned above which were copied by the clerk at Norwich from the licence of 7 December 1631. The third is the cast of sixteen players published in the *Holland's Leaguer* quarto in 1632 and probably referring to the production in 1631; the fourth list is found in a warrant of May 1632 to swear eleven Prince Charles's men as Grooms of the Chamber; and the fifth is a list of six men who are called Prince Charles's players in a petition to the Lord Chamberlain in December 1632. Together these lists give us twenty-one names—an unusually full roster for the first two years of a company's existence. The names are: Joseph Moore, Ellis Worth, Mathew Smith, William Browne, Andrew Cane, James Sneller, Henry Gradwell, Thomas Bond, Richard Fowler, Edward May, Robert Huyt [Hoyt?], Robert Stratford, Richard Godwin, John Wright, Richard Fouch, Arthur

¹ The Blackfriars, in which the Globe company played, was south-east of Salisbury Court; the Phoenix was north-west.

² *Holland's Leaguer*, 1632 quarto, A₄^v.

³ See below, pp 309-10.

⁴ See below, p. 321.

Savill, Samuel Mannery, Thomas Plumfield, William Hall, George Stutville, and William Cooke.

In seeking the previous affiliations of these players, we can eliminate six names, for the *Holland's Leaguer* cast indicates that these six were boys, and therefore it is not strange that they should appear here for the first time. The boys were Robert Stratford, Richard Godwin, John Wright, Richard Fouch, Arthur Savill, and Samuel Mannery. Of the fifteen remaining actors, six cannot be definitely traced to any company before they became Prince Charles's men—Henry Gradwell, Edward May, Robert Huyt, Thomas Plumfield, William Hall, and William Cooke.¹ Of the remaining nine men one, Joseph Moore, had long been a leader of Lady Elizabeth's company and had appeared in that capacity as late as August 1631.¹ Three men had apparently belonged to the vaguely known King and Queen of Bohemia's company—Mathew Smith, Andrew Cane, and Richard Fowler—and a fourth man, Richard Gunnell, who must have been connected with Prince Charles's men as part-owner and probably manager of the Salisbury Court but who appears in no list of the company, had also been a member of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company.² Five Prince Charles's men had formerly been members of the Queen Anne's—Red Bull Revels company—Ellis Worth, William Browne, James Sneller or Kneller, Thomas Bond, and George Stutville¹—and a sixth, John Kirke, who does not appear in company lists in 1631 or 1632 but who does appear in 1640, had been touring with a Red Bull company in 1629.¹

An analysis of the earlier affiliations of the players of Prince Charles's company thus indicates that the company seems to have been drawn largely from two sources, the King and Queen of Bohemia's company at the Fortune and the old Queen Anne's—Red Bull Revels players who were presumably still conducting a dramatic enterprise at the Red Bull. The partial derivation of Prince Charles's company from an old Red Bull organization is also suggested by the fact that four of the former Queen Anne's men, Ellis Worth, William Browne, Thomas Bond, and James Sneller, were still living in St. James's Clerkenwell, the parish of the Red Bull, at this time, and one of the actors of unknown previous affiliations, Henry Gradwell, was living in that parish in

¹ See 'Players'.

² See above, p. 263.

1627, 1628, and 1631.¹ Finally, Prince Charles's company itself had gone to the Red Bull by 1634 and presumably occupied that theatre for some time thereafter.²

Of the origins of Prince Charles's company we can conclude, then, that the organization seems to have been made up chiefly of players from the King and Queen of Bohemia's company at the Fortune and former Queen Anne's—Red Bull Revels players acting in some sort of troupe at the Red Bull. The company moved into the Salisbury Court some time before—probably not long before—December 1631, and on 7 December 1631 was licensed as Prince Charles's men through the instrumentality of the Earl of Dorset. In the early days of its existence the company played with very slight success, but by May 1632 it appears to have gained in prestige, for eleven members of the company were sworn Grooms of the Chamber in that month.

After the warrant for swearing eleven members of the company Grooms of the Chamber, there are no records of Prince Charles's men for two years. It was probably in this period that the troupe moved from the Salisbury Court, for they evidently left that theatre some time between January 1631/2 and July 1634.³ On 18 July 1634 Richard Kendall, one of the wardrobe keepers for the company of the Salisbury Court (King's Revels), was at Oxford with his troupe. While there he told Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of Queen's College, a great deal about the London theatrical companies, and in his diary Crosfield preserved an outline of what Kendall told him. The part which interests us here is: 'The Princes Servants at y^e Red-bull in St Johns street, y^e chiefe Mr Cane a goldsmith,⁴ Mr Worth Mr Smith.'⁵

It is evidently to this move to the Red Bull that Heton referred in his Instructions for his patent: 'And whereas my lo: of Dorsett had gotten for a former Company at Salisbury Co't the Princes service, they being left at liberty, took their opportunity of another house, and left the house in Salisbury Co't destitute both of a service and Company.'⁶

¹ See 'Players'.

² See below.

³ Fleay says (*Stage*, p. 330) that the company left the Salisbury Court when they went on the progress with the King, but this is pure conjecture. Fleay's date for the progress is wrong. See below, p. 311, n. 1.

⁴ See 'Players' for other evidence that he was a goldsmith.

⁵ See Appendix, p. 688.

⁶ See Appendix, p. 684.

Evidently Prince Charles's men were not forced out, but chose to leave. In the light of what we have seen of the make-up of this company, it is not surprising that they were able to secure the Red Bull

Confirmation of this change of theatre is to be found in the will of William Browne, who appears several times as a member of the company. This will, made in the parish of St. James's Clerkenwell, on 23 October 1634, leaves to the actor's mother, Susan Baskerville,

All such some and somes of mony, debts, duties claymes chalenges and demaunds whatsoever as either is ought or shalbe due owing, or belonging vnto me forth, out of and from the redd Bull Playhouse scituate in St John streete in the Countie of Midd[lesex] whereof I am a member, and a fellow sharer. . Item I give to the said Company of players twentie shillings to buy them blacke ribbons to weare in remembrance of me ¹

About the time Kendall told Crosfield of the London companies, the Prince's men had the honour of being selected to accompany the court on a royal progress. This distinction is revealed by two warrants in the Lord Chamberlain's warrant books:

A Tent for the Princes Players	A Warraunt for A Tent, for y ^e Princes Players co ^m maunded to attend the Court during Progresse. eod. [20 July 1634]
Princes Players Allowance	A Councells Warr ^t for 100 ^l for y ^e Princes Players for their Attendance abroad Aug 25. 1634 ²

Evidently the company was selected to provide entertainment for the court during the progress of the summer of 1634. The itinerary of this progress is recorded in the State Papers under date of 14 July 1634.

List of journeys to be daily performed by the King and Queen, during a progress which began this day, and ended on the 27th August. They stayed two nights at Hichinbrook, five at Apethorpe, two at Grimsthorpe, four at Belvoir, six at Welbeck, five at Nottingham; the King stayed five nights at Tutbury, and the Queen eight, and the King three at Holdenby, four at Castle Ashby, and three at Easton.³

Since the warrant for payment of the Prince's men for their attendance was issued two days before the progress was

¹ See Appendix, pp. 636-7.

² *M.S.C.* ii 374.

³ *C.S.P., Dom.* 1634-5, p. 149.

completed, it may be assumed that the company did not stay with the court throughout the King's journeyings¹ The selection of the company for this honour must indicate that Prince Charles's men had gained greatly in repute since the prologues for *Holland's Leaguer* and *Shirley's Changes* were written.

The same suggestion of enhanced reputation is to be found in the record of the company's presentation of three plays at Hampton Court in September and October 1634, and four more at Whitehall in January and February 1634/5 and May 1635. The payees for these performances were Joseph Moore, Andrew Cane, and Ellis Worth² One does not think of a Red Bull company as one which would please the taste of the court—certainly the Red Bull company had a far from courtly reputation a few years later³—but evidently Prince Charles's men had such a standing in 1634.

Two days after the payment for plays given at court, on 12 December 1635, four more members of the company were made Grooms of the Chamber.

Princes Players sworne /	flower seuerrall Warrantes for the swearing of these 4 persones Groomes of the Chamber in ordinary wthout ffee to attend the Prince his Highnes in ye Quality of Players. viz ^t .
-----------------------------	---

William Bankes	William Cooke	} Dec. 12 1635 ⁴
Henry Hamerton.	Iohn Kirke	

Of the four players sworn, William Bankes is the only one previously unknown. William Cooke had already been associated with the company for several years, for he was called one of the Prince's players in a suit of 10 December 1632.⁵ Perhaps he had been a hired man. Henry Hamerton is not known to have been connected with the Prince's men before this date, but he seems to have been an experienced player. He is probably the Henry Hammersley whose daughter was

¹ Fleay (*Stage*, p. 330), followed by Murray (I 220), asserts that the progress on which the Prince's men accompanied the court was that of May, June, and July 1633, when Charles went to Scotland for his coronation. Both Fleay and Murray say that the payment of 1634 must have applied to the progress of 1633 because Charles made no progress between July 1633 and 25 August 1634. Evidently they did not know of the progress of the summer of 1634. The wording of the tent warrant indicates a present or future progress, not one a year past.

² The warrant for payment of £100 is dated 10 December 1635 (*M.S.C.* II. 377).

³ See below, pp. 315-16 and 319-20.

⁴ *M.S.C.* II. 377

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 408.

baptized at St. Giles' Cripplegate in April 1626.¹ There seems to have been a family of Hamertons or Hammertons who were players. Besides Henry, a Nicholas and a Stephen are known in this period. John Kirke is an interesting figure. Mr. W. J. Lawrence has pointed out that he was probably the dramatist of *The Seven Champions of Christendom* (1638),² in 1629 he was touring with the Red Bull company,³ and in 1634 he was at the Fortune as one of the leaders of what appears to be the same company.⁴ The warrant supplies the only record we have of him as a Prince Charles's man.

At least three of the four men named in the warrant seem to have been sworn to replace players who had died since May 1632, when the first group was sworn. The three men who had died were all buried at St. James's Clerkenwell, William Browne on 6 November 1634, James Sneller on 1 December 1634, and Thomas Bond on 25 April 1635.⁴

In the early spring of 1635/6 Prince Charles's company was on the road, for Andrew Cane showed their licence at Norwich on 9 March:

A licence signed by his Ma^{tie} & vnder his privie signet was this day shewed in Court whereby lycence is given to Andrew Kayne to play Comedyes Test 7^o Decembris Anno Septimo Caroli Regis

And they desire that Mr Maior would appoint an officer whome they will content for his paynes to see that pore people, servants & idle psons may be restrained⁵

The last paragraph of this entry is rather amusing when one considers the reputation which these players and their theatre had or soon acquired in London. The request was probably due to the perturbation which the Norwich authorities had been feeling at the constant resort of the working classes to the players.⁶ There is evidence, however, that the players actually did attempt to appeal to the upper classes in Norwich. Anthony Mingay wrote to Framlingham Gowdy, of West Harling, Norfolk, in a letter dated 8 March 1635/6, a comment on the Norwich performance of the company: 'I pray tell your sons that the Red Bull company of players are now in town, and have acted one play with good applause and are well clad and act by candlelight.'⁷ These niceties are

¹ See 'Players'.

² 'John Kirke', *Stud. Phil.* xxi. 586.

³ Murray, II 386.

⁴ See 'Players'.

⁵ Murray, II 358

⁶ See *ibid.*, p. 355.

⁷ *Hist MSS Com.*, Report X, Appendix 2, p. 157 (Gawdy MSS). Professor Murray concluded (op. cit. I. 274) that the company was the Red Bull company, but it must be remembered that that company now performed

more suggestive of a Blackfriars company than a Red Bull troupe. One wonders if such practices could have been common with the touring companies. It seems more likely that a special effort was being made to show the Norwich city fathers just how refined dramatic presentations could be.

It was not long after the company's visit to Norwich that all London performances were forbidden because of the onset of one of the city's most protracted plague visitations. The theatres were closed on 12 May 1636, and except for a short interval of one week—24 February to 1 March 1636/7—they remained closed until 2 October 1637, nearly seventeen months.¹

Such a long period of idleness spelled disaster for players; companies were frequently wrecked by plague closings. How Prince Charles's company held together through this long period we do not know. Perhaps they were able to tour part of the time, for there is a notice of 'the Princes players' at Dover between the 8th of April and the 8th of August 1636.² This single record, however, is our only trace of Prince Charles's men during the plague period.

Evidently the company did hold together and did not deteriorate too greatly during their long term of idleness, for shortly after the theatres were reopened, in November and December 1637, Prince Charles's men were called upon to present three plays at court.³

In the following year the Princes' men were unfortunate in the disturbances which occurred at their theatre. On 16 January 1637/8 recognizances were taken before a Justice of the Peace for the appearance of Thomas Pinnocke, silk-weaver, to answer 'for menacing and threatening to pull downe the Redbull playhouse and strikinge divers people

at the Fortune and Prince Charles's men at the Red Bull. Furthermore, the Red Bull players were usually insistent on their title of King's men in the provinces. The identity of the company at Norwich is established by the fact that though there is no reference to the Red Bull company in the Norwich records at this period, there is a reference to Andrew Cane's visit. It is disconcerting that the Norwich records say that Cane arrived with his company on the ninth and that this letter was written on the eighth. It seems to me, however, that it is much more likely that there is a mistake of a day or so in the date of the letter than that the Red Bull company should have visited Norwich without leaving any note in the unusually complete Norwich records and at the very time Prince Charles's company was in town and their visit recorded by the Norwich clerk.

¹ See Appendix, pp. 661-5.

² Murray, ii 267.

³ Joseph Moore was paid for the performances 21 March 1637/8 (*M.S.C.* ii. 387).

with a great cudgell as he went alonge the streets'.¹ Again, on 23 August 1638 similar steps were taken for the appearance of Thomas Jacob to answer 'for committing a greate disorder in the Red Bull playhouse and for assaulting and beating divers persons there'.² These records scarcely suggest the highest type of audience at the Red Bull.

In September of 1639 the company was again in trouble. Under the date of 29 September we find the following account in the State Papers:

Order of the King in Council Complaint was this day made that the stage-players of the Red Bull [have for] many days together acted a scandalous and libellous [play in which] they have audaciously reproached and in a libel [represented] and personated not only some of the aldermen of the [city of London] and some other persons of quality, but also scandalized and libelled the whole profession of proctors belonging to the Court of [Probate], and reflected upon the present Government. Ordered that the Attorney-General be hereby prayed forthwith to call before him, not only the poet who made the play and the actors that played the same, but also the person that licensed it, and having diligently examined the truth of the said complaint, to proceed roundly against such of them as he shall find have been faulty, and to use such effectual ex[pedition] to bring them to sentence, as that their exemplary punishment may [check] such insolencies betimes.³

Exceptions taken to the play above referred to. In the play called 'The Whore New Vamped,' where there was mention of the new duty on wines, one personating a justice of the peace, says to Cain 'Sirrah, I'll have you before the alderman,' whereto Cain replies, 'The alderman, the alderman is a base, drunken, sottish knave, I care not for the alderman, I say the alderman is a base, drunken, sottish knave.' Another says, 'How now Sirrah, what alderman do you speak of?' Then Cain says, 'I mean alderman [William Abell], the blacksmith in Holborn,' says the other, 'Was he not a Vintner?' Cain answers, 'I know no other.' In another part of the play one speaking of projects and patents that he had got, mentions among others 'a patent for 12 *d* a piece upon every proctor and proctor's man who was not a knave.' Said another, 'Was there ever known any proctor but he was an arrant knave?'⁴

¹ *Midd. Co. Rec.* iii. 168

² *Ibid.*

³ The more accurate version from the Privy Council Register printed *M. S. C.* i. 394-5 presents the same account except that it gives the proctor as belonging to 'the Courte of the Cruill Lawe' instead of the Court of Probate. The Privy Council Register does not, however, give the second document at all.

⁴ *C. S. P., Dom.*, 1639, pp. 529-30. Any doubts concerning the identity of the company at the Red Bull at this time are set at rest by the mention of Andrew Cane as one of the actors.

What punishment fell upon the players for this offence we do not know, but they were not in any very permanent disgrace, for in November following they gave three plays at Richmond, and the culprit, Andrew Cane, with Joseph Moore received the company's payment on 4 May 1640.¹

It appears that in the spring of 1640 Prince Charles's men and the Red Bull players exchanged theatres. Malone quotes from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, 'At Easter 1640, the Princes company went to the Fortune, and the Fortune company to the Red Bull'.² We know nothing of the reason for this change, though we have a few hints in the following poem which was published in the 1640 quarto of John Tatham's *Fancies Theatre* (S R. 15 October 1640):

*A Prologue spoken upon the removing of the
late Fortune Players to the Bull*

Who would rely on Fortune, when *shee's* knowne
An *enemie* to Merit, and hath shewne
Such an example here? Wee that have pay'd
Her tribute to our losse, each night defray'd
The charge of her attendance, now growne poore,
(Through her expences) thrusts us out of doore.
For some peculiar profit; shee has t'ane
A course to banish Modesty, and retaine
More dinn, and *incivility* than hath been
Knowne in the *Bearwards Court*, the *Beargarden*.
Those that now sojourne with *her*, bring a noyse
Of *Rables*, *Apple-wives* and Chimney-boyes,
Whose shrill confused Ecchoes loud doe cry,
Enlarge your *Commons*, Wee hate *Privacie*
Those that have plots to *undermine*, and strive
To blow their Neighbours up, so *they* may thrive,
What censure they deserve, *wee* leave to you,
To whom the judgement on't belongs as due.
Here Gentlemen, our Anchor's fixt; And wee
(Disdaining Fortunes mutability)
Expect your kinde acceptance, then wee'l sing
(Protected by your smiles our ever-spring,)
As pleasant as if wee had still possess

¹ *M.S.C.* II. 394

² *Herbert*, p. 66. Evidently Prince Charles's company acquired the actor, John Shank, son of the famous comedian of the King's company, along with the theatre. He was an actor at the Fortune in February 1639/40. A few months after the transfer of the Prince's men to that theatre, Shank was sworn, 17 December 1640, a Groom of the Chamber to attend the Prince as player (see 'Players').

Our lawfull Portion out of Fortunes brest.
 Onely wee would request you to forbear
 Your wonted custome, banding *Tyle*, or Peare
 Against our *curtaines*, to allure *us* forth.
 I pray take notice *these* are of more Worth,
 Pure Naples silk not *Worstead*, we have ne're
 An Actour here has mouth enough to teare
Language by th'eaes, this forlorne Hope shall be
 By Us refin'd from such grosse injury.
 And then let your judicious Loves advance
 Vs to our Merits, them to their Ignorance

The implication in the prologue is that the 'Fortune Players' had had financial difficulties in their theatre and that Prince Charles's men had plotted to have them ejected and so secure their house. Moreover, Prince Charles's men are charged with bringing to the Fortune 'dinn and incivility' and 'a noyse of *Rables*, *Apple-wives* and Chimney-boyes' and mouths to 'teare *Language* by th'eaes'. Too much reliance cannot be placed on this one side of the story, though there are later repetitions of this charge of noisy vulgarity on Prince Charles's stage.¹

About the time of the exchange of theatres, a ticket of privilege was granted for four hired men of the Prince's company, on 25 April 1640. The men named are Silvester Lancaster, Richard Honyman, Roger Nore,² and John Earle.³ This ticket is the only evidence we have to connect any of these men with a company, though Roger Nore appears several times as a player in the registers of St. Giles' Cripplegate,⁴ and Richard Honyman was probably the brother of John Honyman, the King's man.⁵

In September of 1640 the theatres were again closed because of plague. The Privy Council issued its closing order on 11 September 1640,⁶ but the theatres remained dark only six or seven weeks, for there are several records of performances in the first and second weeks in November.⁷

In the following year the plague returned. On 5 August 1641, if my reading of Chalmers's extracts from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book is correct, the theatres were closed, and they were not allowed to open until some time in November.⁸

¹ See 'Players': Fowler, and below, pp. 319-20

² Both Mrs Stopes and Miss Boswell read this name as More, but I think they were mistaken. See 'Players'.

³ See 'Players'.

⁴ See John Honyman's will, p. 645.

⁵ See Plague Appendix, pp. 665-6.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ See Plague Appendix, pp. 666-7.

It was during this plague closing of 1641 that there appeared the well-known *Stage-Players Complaint*, a dialogue between the fool of Prince Charles's company, Andrew Cane, and 'Reed of the Friars'.¹ Since Cane is called in the title 'Cane of the *Fortune*' and since this pamphlet was evidently intended to appeal to an audience conversant with theatrical affairs, we have evidence that Prince Charles's men had remained at the Fortune at least as late as the autumn of 1641.²

Further evidence that Prince Charles's men were associated with the Fortune in the last days of the theatre is to be found in Act III of John Tatham's (?) *Knavery in All Trades*,

¹ This pamphlet has been variously dated, apparently because the copy which Collier saw, or heard of, was undated or had had the date trimmed off. Collier said it belonged to 1625 (*H.E.D.P.* II 37 n), and Fleay said 1640 (*Stage*, p. 359). The copy in the British Museum bears the date 1641 on the title-page, and so does the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library. Numerous pieces of internal evidence fix the part of the year pretty surely as the autumn. There are several references both in the title and in the dialogue to the fact that the theatres were closed because of the plague. The lines,

Quick. The last Comedy, quothu? I act Tragedies every day, but I cannot remember since I acted a Comedy, 'tis so long agoe.

Light. But Prithee how comes it to passe that you act Tragedies every day.

Quick. How? J'll tell thee. my purse each day perissheth most Tragædically . . .

would indicate that the actors had been idle for some time. Since a pamphlet about the distress of the actors during a plague closing would have had little point after the reopening of the theatres, the date would appear to be September, October, or November (i.e. some little time after the closing of 5 August and before the opening > 1 December). Such a date suits well the allusion of *Quick* to political events of June and July 1641: 'For Monopolers are downe, Projectors are downe, the High Commission Court is downe, the Starre-Chamber is downe . . .'

That the pamphlet appeared in the autumn of 1641 seems to me, then, indubitable.

² The various confusing references to Andrew Cane, apparently the most widely known member of the company, may throw some doubt on this assumption, yet it seems to me the only one that can be made.

As we have just seen, Cane appeared in the pamphlet of the autumn of 1641 as 'Cane of the *Fortune*', but in a Puritan news book of 12 December 1642 he was called 'Cane the Clown at the Bull', and in another of 17-24 June 1644, 'the *quondam* foole of the Red Bull'; in 1648 a writer said 'we can laugh . . . as ever we did at Cane at the Red Bull', and in 1673 Henry Chapman said that a book without an appendix 'finds as small acceptance as a Comedy did formerly at the *Fortune* Play-house, without a Jig of Andrew Kein's into the bargain'. (See 'Players'.)

To the people he seems to have been known as Cane of the Fortune or Cane of the Red Bull. He had acted at both houses. It is natural that after the closing of the theatres he should be associated with the Red Bull where he acted surreptitiously.

written after the Restoration, in which a group of gentlemen talk of the actors before the war:

[A group in a Coffee House are talking.]

third. Gentlemen, has any of you seen the Play of *Harry* the eight?

fourth Many years ago I did

fifth And so did I

third 'Tis rarely set forth, they say

third . . . Bur (*sic*) sir, they say 'tis done rarely well

fourth. I cannot believe it, 'tis impossible they should do any thing so well as I have seen things done.

fifth When *Taylor Lowen*, and *Pollard* were alive.

fourth. Did you not know *Benfield*, and *Swaunted*?

fifth. Did I not know 'em? yes, and hum'd them off a hundred times

fourth. But did you know *Mat Smith*, *Elis Worth*, and *Fowler* at the Fortune?

fifth Yes, and I will tell you by a good token; *Fowler* you know was appointed for the Conquering parts, and it being given out he was to play the Part of a great Captain and mighty Warriour, drew much Company; the Play began, and ended with his Valour; but at the end of the Fourth Act he laid so heavily about him, that some Mutes who stood for Souldiers, fell down as they were dead e're he had toucht their trembling Targets; so he brandisht his Sword & made his *Exit*; ne're minding to bring off his dead men; which they perceiving, crauld into the Tyreing house, at which, *Fowler* grew angry, and told 'em, Dogs you should have laine there till you had been fetcht off; and so they crauld out again, which gave the People such an occasion of Laughter, they cry'd that again that again, that again.

fourth. I but what d'ye call him was the man; he plaid the devil in Doctor *Faustus*, and a fellow in the Gallery throwing a Tobacco-Pipe at him; I hope to see thee (quoth He) e're long as bad as I am, what's that quoth the fellow? the Son of a Whore quoth He.

Omnes. Ha, ha, ha

first. You talk of your Players, I am for the Fencers, there are none living now like old *Bradshaw*, old *Batty*, *Chatterton*, and *Ned Gibs*.¹

¹ [John Tatham], *Knavery in all Trades Or, The Coffee-House*. A Comedy. As it was Acted in the Christmas Holidays by several Apprentices With great Applause. With License. London, . . . 1664. Act III. D₄^v, E₁.

The mention of Ellis Worth, Mathew Smith, and Richard Fowler leaves no possible doubt that the Fortune company was Prince Charles's men. The popularity of Fowler and the company's blood-and-thunder plays is demonstrated in the speaker's assumption that the mere announcement that Fowler would play 'a great Captain and mighty Warriour' is a sufficient explanation of the crowd in the theatre.¹

Apparently *fourth* is still speaking of the Fortune company in his speech about *Doctor Faustus*, since he is the man who turned the conversation to Smith, Worth, and Fowler. If so, we have evidence that Prince Charles's men were performing Marlowe's play a year or so before the closing of the theatres. I cannot identify the actor who played the devil or see the point of his reply to the pipe thrower.

I know of no further records of Prince Charles's men. It appears, however, from various allusions that both this company and the actors at the Red Bull continued to be thought of as inferior players until the closing of the theatres. Professor Rollins quotes from a satirical broadside of June 1641 called *The Late [and The last] Will and Testament of the Doctors Commons*,

Item, I will and bequeath all my large Bookes of Acts, to them of the Fortune Play-House, for I hold it a deed of charity, in regard they want good action.

All my great Books of Acts to be divided between the Fortune and the Bull; for they spoyle many a good Play for want of Action.²

The same characterization of these two theatres is to be seen in the complimentary verses which Sir Aston Cokayne wrote for Brome's *Five New Plays*, published in 1653. Cokayne looks forward to the time when the theatres may reopen. After mentioning the Phoenix, Globe, Blackfriars, and White Friars [Salisbury Court], he continues,

Our *Theaters* of lower note in those
More happy daies, shall scorne the rustick Prose
Of a *Jack-pudding*, and will please the Rout,
With wit enough to beare their Credit out.

¹ The same suggestion of the company's blood-and-thunder plays and of Fowler's popular ranting is to be seen in a passage in Rawlins's *Rebellion* acted by a rival company. See 'Players' Richard Fowler.

² Rollins, 'Commonwealth Drama', p. 270.

The Fortune will be lucky, see no more
 Her Benches bare, as they have stood before
 The Bull take Courage from Applauses given,
 To Eccho to the *Taurus* in the Heaven

But the ranting of the Fortune and Red Bull was not for long. Soon comes the eloquent entry in Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, 'Here ended my allowance of plaies, for the war began in Aug. 1642',¹

LISTS AND CHARTS

The sources for the various lists of Prince Charles's men on p. 321 are as follows.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Murray, ii 358 (two entries) | 7 Ibid |
| 2. 1632 quarto, A ₄ . | 8 Ibid., pp. 394-5. |
| 3. <i>M.S.C.</i> ii. 358 | 9. Ibid, p 394. |
| 4. Ibid, p 408 | 10 Ibid, p 396. |
| 5. Appendix, p 688. | 11. 1664 edition, D ₄ ^v and E ₁ . |
| 6. <i>M.S.C.</i> ii. 377. | |

¹ *Herbert*, p. 39.

ACTOR LISTS

Actors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Licence of 7 Dec 1631 shown at Norwich	Cast of Holland's Leaguer > Dec 1631	Sworn Grooms May 1632	Called Prince's Men in Petition 10 Dec 1632	Named Leaders Crosfield's Diary 18 July 1634	Paid for Plays at Court 10 Dec 1635	Sworn Grooms 12 Dec 1635	Servants' Tickets of Privilege 25 Apr 1640	Paid for Plays at Court 4 May 1640	Sworn Groom 17 Dec 1640	Mentioned in Knavery in All Trades, 1664
Joseph Moore	.	Ardelio	1		2	1			X		X
Elis Worth	.	Agurtes	2		3	2					
Mathew Smith	.	Philantus	3	1	1	3					
William Browne	.	Trimalchio	4	2							
Andrew Cane	.	Autolochus	5	3							
James Sneller	.	Capitrio	6	4							
Henry Godwell	.	Miscellaneo	7								
Thomas Bond	.	Spardio	8								
Richard Fowler	.	Fedelo	9								
Edward May	.	Jeffery	10								
Richard Hury	.	Triphocna	11								
Robert Stratford	.	Festina									
Richard Godwin	.	Millicent									
John Wright	.	Margery									
Richard Fouch	.	Quartilla									
Arthur Savil	.	Bawd									
Samuel Mannery	.										
Thomas Plumfield	.										
William Hall	.										
George Stutville	.										
William Cooke	.										
William Bankes	.										
Henry Hamerton	.										
John Kirke	.										
Silvester Lancaster	.										
Richard Honyman	.										
Roger Nore	.										
John Earle	.										
John Shank	.										

PROVINCIAL NOTICES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Source</i>
8 Mar 1633/4-	Dover	Murray, ii. 267
8 Apr. 1634		
Aug 1634	Coventry	Ibid., p. 252
10 Aug. 1634	Leicester	Ibid., p. 318
7 Sept. 1634	Southampton	Ibid., p. 399
3 Nov. 1635	Norwich	Ibid., p. 358
9 Mar 1635/6	Norwich	Ibid., p. 358
8 Apr.-8 Aug. 1636	Dover	Ibid., p. 267
21 Feb 1637/8	Norwich	Ibid., p. 358
9 Aug.-6 Sept. 1641	Dover	Ibid., p. 267

PLAYS GIVEN AT COURT BY PRINCE CHARLES'S MEN

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
>15 June 1633 ^a	<i>A Fine Companion</i>	?	?	1633 t.p.
14 July-25 Aug. 1634 ^b	?	£100	25 Aug 1634	<i>M S.C</i> ii. 374
Sept. and Oct 1634	3	60	10 Dec. 1635 ^c	Ibid., p. 377
Jan. and Feb 1634/5, May 1635	4	40		
Nov. and Dec. 1637	3	40	21 Mar. 1637/8 ^d	Ibid., p. 387
Nov. 1639	3	60	4 May 1640 ^e	Ibid., p. 394

^a Entered S. R. this date.

^b Besides the warrant for payment, there is another for a tent for the Prince's players, 'coffmaunded to attend the Court during Progresse'. Actually neither warrant mentions performances, presumably the reason for attendance. On the date, see above, pp. 310-11

^c Joseph Moore, Andrew Cane, and Ellis Worth are mentioned in the warrant

^d Joseph Moore payee.

^e Joseph Moore and Andrew Cane payees.

REPERTORY OF PRINCE CHARLES'S COMPANY

DAY, JOHN. *The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*. 1st ed 1659; the title-page says, 'as it was divers times publickly acted by the Princes Servants'. Chambers says (Chambers, *E.S.* iii. 285), 'The Prince's men of the title are probably the later Prince Charles's (1631-41), but these were the ultimate successors of Prince Henry's, formerly the Admiral's, who produced, between May 1600 and Sept. 1601, three parts of a play called indifferently by Henslowe *The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green* and *Thomas Strowd*.' I agree with Sir Edmund's general conclusion, though I should have one more step in the descent of the play than he would.

MARMION, SHAKERLEY. *A Fine Companion*. 1st ed. 1633; the title-page says, 'Acted before the King and Queene at White-Hall, And sundrie times with great applause at the private House in Salisbury Court, By the Prince his Servants'.

— *Holland's Leaguer*. 1st ed. 1632, the title-page says, 'As It Hath Bin Lately and often Acted with great applause, by the high and mighty Prince Charles his Servants; at the private house in *Salisbury Court*'¹

SHIRLEY, JAMES. *Changes* 1st ed. 1632 (See above, pp. 304-7.)

ANONYMOUS. *Edmond Ironside*. 1st ed. 1928 (Malone Society).

B.M. MS. Egerton 1994⁵. It has been pointed out that the names of the actors in this MS.—Edward May, Henry Gradwell, George Stutville, and H. Gibson—indicate that the play was revived in the third decade of the seventeenth century, but it has not been noted before that these actors give a strong suggestion of the company which revived the play. Three of these men, Gradwell, Stutville, and May, were Prince Charles's men in 1631 and 1632 and are not known to have been associated in any other company; the fourth, Gibson, is not known to have been connected with any company. See 'Players'.

— *The Whore New Vamped*. Not extant. In *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1639, pp. 529-30, complaint is made that 'the stage-players of the Red Bull' have presented a scandalous and libellous play of this name in which 'Cain' was a principal actor. See above, p. 314

¹ Malone, evidently writing from Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, says, 'The play of *Holland's Leaguer* was acted six days successively at Salisbury Court, in December, 1631 . . .' (*Variorum*, III. 178; *Herbert*, p. 45). This statement, however, can scarcely be accepted as evidence of the popularity of the play, because Malone recorded that Herbert received only £1 19s in virtue of his one-ninth share. Possibly the large number of performances was due to the limited repertory of the company.

CHAPTER XI

THE KING AND QUEEN'S YOUNG COMPANY

(BEESTON'S BOYS)¹

OUR first knowledge of the existence of this company comes from Sir Henry Herbert's record of the plays given before the royal family at St. James's during the plague of 1636-7:

¹ The exact character of this company is somewhat puzzling. It seems to have been neither a boy company of the old type, nor yet an adult company like the others. It is frequently called the 'young company' or 'Beeston's Boys' in contemporary records; in Beeston's petition of 17 September 1637 it is said that he had 'many young Actors lying at his Charge'; and Brome, in the epilogue to his *Court Beggar* (see below, p. 334), speaking apparently of William Beeston and this company, says, 'There's wit in that now. But this small Poet vents none but his own, and his by whose care and directions this Stage is govern'd, who has for many yeares both in his fathers dayes, and since directed Poets to write & Players to speak till he trau'd up these youths here to what they are now. I some of 'em from before they were able to say a grace of two lines long to have more parts in their pates then would fill so many Dry-fats.' There seems to be the same indication of a boy company in Flecknoe's Postscript to his *Love's Dominion*, in which he says he wishes the acting rights to be vested in 'Mr Will Beeston, who by Reason of his long Practice and Experience in this way, as also for having brought up most of the Actors extant, I think the fittest Man for this Charge and Employment'.

In spite of these indications, however, Their Majesties' Servants cannot have been an old-fashioned boy company. Five of the company were old enough to be called before the Privy Council in 1637 (see below, p. 327), in 1639 tickets of privilege were issued to twelve actors of the organization (*M S C.* ii. 390-1), in 1640 three of them were sent to the Marshalsea (*ibid.*, p. 394), Sir Henry Herbert allowed the others to play again 'upon their petition of submission subscribed by the players' (*Herbert*, p. 66), and in the Lord Chamberlain's appointment of Davenant as governor of the company, obedience to Davenant is enjoined from the actors 'and euery one belonging as prentices or seruantes to those Actors' (see below, pp. 334-5). Moreover, at Christopher Beeston's death in 1638 the company owned one-third of its own stock, and Beeston bequeathed it another third (see below, pp. 631-3), not a legacy for children. If this is not sufficient proof of the mature age of some of the members, it can be shown that both Beestons, Bird, Axen, Page, Gibbs, and Stutville were adults by the time of the opening of the theatres in 1637, shortly after Christopher Beeston had organized the company (see 'Players').

This oddly dual character of Beeston's Boys sets it apart from most of the other Caroline companies. Its peculiar status is perhaps indicated by the fact that it is the only company (so far as the extant records indicate) which had a 'Gouernor & Instructor' (see below, pp. 330 and 334-5). Furthermore, there are no records that the members of this company (except for Stutville and the Beestons, who had been sworn as members of earlier companies) were ever sworn Grooms of the Chamber, as the other London

'*Cupid's Revenge*, at St James, by Beeston's boyes, the 7 Febr.¹

'*Wit without Money*, by the B. boyes at St. James, the 14 Feb.²

Shortly after these court records come other indications that there was something new at the Cockpit. On 21 February 1636/7 the Lord Chamberlain's clerk noted a 'Warrant to sweare M^r Christopher Bieston his Ma^{tes} servant in y^e place of Gouuernor of the new Company of the Kinges & Queenes boyes'.³ It was probably this appointment of Beeston that Sir Henry Herbert referred to when he recorded in his office-book, 'Mr Beeston was commanded to make a company of boyes, and began to play at the Cockpit with them the same day'.⁴

It will be observed that Herbert's note on Beeston's company says that he 'began to play at the Cockpit with them the same day'. In the last entry but one Sir Henry had noticed that the companies had a brief respite from the prohibition of acting beginning on 24 February 1636/7,⁵ three days

players were, and the name of the company is omitted from the list of those whose members had been so sworn in 1641 (*M.S.C.* ii. 327).

All these facts lead to the following conclusions. (1) The company of Beeston's Boys was so called not because it was made up entirely of children, but because it made use of an unusually large number of boys (which would account, among other things, for the surprising number of solos and choruses in *The Jovial Crew*, which Richard Brome wrote for the company) (2) The company included several adults, probably enough for most of the adult male roles in their plays. (3) Though the company had a Governor and Instructor for the boys, the responsibility was not vested entirely in any one man, but was shared by several who were answerable to the authorities and who probably held stock in the organization

¹ *Herbert*, p. 57

² *Ibid.*, p. 58 Perhaps it was in this series of court performances that the new company produced *The Cid*. Certainly they played it in 1637, for the play was published in this year—probably the year of their organization and certainly the year of their first appearance—as 'acted before their Majesties at Court, and on the *Cock-pit* Stage in *Drury-lane*, by the servants to both their Majesties'.

³ *M.S.C.* ii. 382.

⁴ *Herbert*, p. 66. This item is undated. Because it follows the record of the reopening of the theatres on 2 October 1637 (see Queen Henrietta's, pp. 236–7), it is sometimes assigned to that date. Such an assignment is obviously incorrect. In the first place, the above warrant shows that Beeston was officially made governor several months before the final opening of the theatres on 2 October. In the second place, all the entries of this series in Herbert's office-book were obviously made after the dates to which they refer (even the 2 October entry says 'when they *had* leave to play') and probably indicate that Herbert jotted them into his office-book as memoranda of important events after the theatres were in full operation again.

⁵ The Privy Council ordered the theatres closed again on 1 March 1636/7. See Plague Appendix, p. 662.

after the entry of Beeston's warrant in the Lord Chamberlain's books. Thus it seems quite possible that the governor of the new company received his warrant the day the theatres were allowed their short period of activity, that his new company began public performances on that day, and that Sir Henry's vague notes refer to this sequence of events.

We know little more about the reasons for the formation of this company than we do about most others. As was so often the case, it was organized while the theatres were closed in plague time.¹ It had the patronage of both the King and the Queen, and Sir Henry Herbert's note of its beginnings seems to indicate that they were directly responsible for its formation. However, we have seen that this entry of Herbert's is of doubtful date; Herbert's wording, if taken literally, indicates a stark impossibility; and it is noteworthy that when the company first appears it is not called the King and Queen's company, as it surely would have been had it recently been organized by royal command. It seems likely on the whole that Beeston saw a theatrical opportunity while the theatres were closed, collected and trained his company,² and made enough of a success with them at court in February 1636/7 to secure royal patronage.

Although most of the well-known players of the old Queen Henrietta's company were excluded from this organization,³ it seems that Beeston had nevertheless formed his new company chiefly from his previous tenants at the Cockpit.⁴ Of the seventeen names associated with the King and Queen's company,⁵ six, and probably seven, had been connected with Queen Henrietta's men,⁶ and of the five leaders of the new company mentioned in the Privy Council order of 12 May 1637,⁷ certainly three, and probably four, had formerly belonged to Queen Henrietta's.⁸ Of the others who were of the King and Queen's company before August 1639, two had

¹ See Queen Henrietta's, pp. 236-9.

² See pp. 218-19, above, for Beeston's similar procedure during the plague of 1625.

³ See Queen Henrietta's, pp. 237-9, and King's, pp. 56-7.

⁴ Certainly the King and Queen's company retained most of the plays of Queen Henrietta's, but this was probably due to the fact that the rights in the plays were vested in Beeston and not in the company.

⁵ See below, p. 336.

⁶ Christopher Beeston, Theophilus Bird, Ezekiel Fenn, Robert Axen, John Page, George Statville, and probably William Beeston.

⁷ See below, p. 327.

⁸ Christopher Beeston, Theophilus Bird, Ezekiel Fenn, and probably William Beeston.

been in the King's Revels,¹ three had been in Prince Charles's company in 1631 and 1632,² two had been boys in the King's company,³ and four, possibly five, had not appeared before.⁴ The company of Beeston's Boys, then, looks like a group of Queen Henrietta's players with certain recruits from other London companies and, probably, with the addition of several boys whose names do not appear in the records.

There are several evidences of the activities of this new company before the theatres were allowed to open on 2 October 1637. On 10 May 1637 Beeston was paid for 'two Playes Acted by the new Company' at court.⁵ Unfortunately, the manager of the Cockpit seems to have been impatient to present his boys to the general public, and thereby got himself into trouble. Two days after the payment mentioned above and while the theatres were still closed, the Privy Council at its sitting of 12 May 1637 sent out the following warrant.

A warrant to Iaspar Heyley Messenger to fetch before the Lords Christopher and W^m. Biston Theophit Bird Ezech: Fenn & Michael Moone wth a Clause to Command the Keepers of the Playhouse called the Cockpit in Drury Lane who either live in it or have relaçon to it not to permit Playes to bee Acted there till further Order. Dated y^e 12th Signed Lo A Bp of Cant Lo Keeper Lo: Treärer, Lo P: Seale M^r Sec Coke./⁶

It is probable that the offence for which these five players were called before the Privy Council is revealed in an undated petition of Beeston's which has been conjecturally dated 1636 but which more probably belongs to 1637, following shortly after the warrant of 12 May. The petition among the State Papers is as follows:

Petition of Christopher Beeston to the Council. Petitioner being commanded to erect and prepare a company of young actors for their Majesties' service, and being desirous to know how they profited by his instructions, invited some noblemen and gentlemen to see them act at his house, the Cockpit. For which,

¹ Edward Gibbs and George Stutville.

² George Stutville, John Wright, and Samuel Mannery.

³ William Trigg and Nicholas Burt.

⁴ Michael Moon or Mohun, John Lacie, Robert Cox, Robert Shatterell, and Edward Davenport—unless he was the Edward Dampont who was a member of a provincial company in 1633. A few players, notably George Stutville, had appeared in more than one company before they joined Beeston's Boys.

⁵ *M.S.C.* ii. 383. Probably these plays were the ones mentioned by Herbert. See above, p. 325.

⁶ *M.S.C.* i. 392.

since he perceives it is imputed as a fault, he is very sorry, and craves pardon.¹

Beeston was a wily manager. If his intentions really were those which he set forth, he was using a clever device to advertise his new company in recruiting its first audience by invitation. If he had simply defied the closing order and reopened his theatre, the tone which he took in his petition was nicely calculated to mollify the Council. In either case it is evident that the consequences of his rashness were not very serious to Beeston, for on 10 June 1637, just a month after his summons from the Privy Council, his company seems to have stood high in favour. On this date the Lord Chamberlain wrote to the Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company upon complaint of the players that some of their plays were about to be printed without authority. The Lord Chamberlain mentions specifically that no plays shall be printed without 'some Certificate in writing vnder the handes of Iohn Lowen & Ioseph Taylor for the Kings seruantes & of Christopher Beeston for y^e Kings & Queenes young Company'.² Such interference on the behalf of these two companies alone is not likely to have taken place had one of them been in disgrace, or even out of favour.

Except for one short interval,³ the theatres had now been closed for more than a year. Many of the players must have been in dire straits, for even the liberal court rewards of these years could not support such protracted idleness. One gets the impression that, harassed by their difficulties and probably indignant at the undue delay in reopening the theatres, the players took some united action, for within a week the three leading companies all petitioned to be allowed to play again.⁴ Beeston's petition for his young actors came first; it is recorded in connexion with the Privy Council sitting of 17 September.

Whereas Christopher Beeston their Mat^{ies}: Seruaunt did by his humble Petiçon presented to the Boord shewe that having many

¹ *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1636-7, p. 254.

² *M.S.C.* ii. 384-5. The document is quoted and discussed above, pp. 53-5.

³ See Plague Appendix, pp. 661-5.

⁴ See King's, pp. 55-6, and Queen Henrietta's, p. 240. The players were certainly well within their rights in their petitions. For four weeks the reports of plague deaths had been below the danger mark of forty. The last weekly report referred to was nineteen deaths reported on 14 September. See Plague Appendix, p. 670.

young Actors lying at his Charge a long time vnpractised by reason of y^e restraint occasioned by y^e Infeccon of y^e plague in and neare London, whereby they are much disabled to performe their desired Service, And therefore humbly besought that they might have leave to practise for y^e better performance of their duties, when they shalbee commanded. It was therevpon Ordered his Ma^{t^{ie}} present in Councell that the said Beeston should bee at libertie to practise his said Actors, at Michaelmas next, if by that time there bee noe considerable encrease of the Sicknesse, or that there dye not of y^e Infeccon in and about London more then there died this last weeke /¹

According to Sir Henry Herbert's office-book, playing actually began on the 2nd of October,² and the King and Queen's young players were evidently soon drawing the courtly audience for which they had been organized. On the 9th of November Mr. Garrard wrote to the Lord Deputy in Ireland,

Here hath been an horrible Noise about the Lady *Newport's* being become a *Romish* Catholick, she went one Evening as she came from a Play in *Drury-Lane* to *Somerset-House*, where one of the Capuchins reconciled her to the *Popish* Church, of which she is now a weak Member³

Nobody seems to have attributed Lady Newport's apostasy to the play she had seen, though it sounds like just the sort of evidence which was considered very weighty by William Prynne.

We have no knowledge of the company's activities in the next year, save that Ford's *Lady's Trial* was licensed to them on 3 May 1638⁴

In the autumn of this year occurred the death of Christopher Beeston, the manager of the company and perhaps the most interesting figure on the Caroline stage; he was buried at St. Giles in the Fields on 15 October 1638. His will, made on the 4th and 7th of October 1638 and probated on the 30th of December,⁵ throws considerable light on the organization of the King and Queen's company. According to this document, the stock in the enterprise was divided into six shares, of which Beeston owned four,⁶ but by his will he gave up two of his shares to be used for the advancement of

¹ *M.S.C.* i. 393.

² Herbert, p. 65.

³ *Sirafforde's Letters*, ii. 128.

⁴ Herbert, pp. 37-8.

⁵ See Appendix, pp. 631-3.

⁶ If previous companies at the Cockpit were controlled in this way, their not infrequent disappearance and their invariable loss of plays to Beeston is not difficult to understand.

the company and left two to his wife. He seems to have provided the company with costumes, as he requests his wife to continue to furnish apparel. The will provides that Mrs. Beeston is to pay William Beeston £20 per annum for his efforts in the company's behalf, but a codicil alters this provision and declares instead that he shall receive one-half of one of the two shares left to Mrs. Beeston. As Mr. Hotson points out,¹ the alteration indicates that a share at this time was worth about £40 a year, or that the total annual profit of the theatre was about £240.

Although William Beeston became manager of the King and Queen's young company at his father's death, the references in the will to Mrs. Elizabeth Beeston's knowledge of her husband's affairs and her possession of one-fourth interest in the company indicate that she must have had some part in the direction of the King and Queen's players after Christopher Beeston's death. William was sworn as governor of the company to succeed his father on 5 April 1639.

W^m Bieston. A warr^t to sweare Mr W^m Bieston his Ma^{tes} servant in Ordinary in y^e Quality and vnder the Title of Gouuernor & Instructor of the Kings & Queens young Company of Actors. Apr. 5. 1639

A certificate also for him.²

Probably one of William Beeston's first acts as manager was to secure Richard Brome as poet for the Cockpit. Brome had been chief dramatist for the Salisbury Court for more than three years, and a contract to bind him to that theatre for seven years more had been prepared, but his last play was written for the Salisbury Court some time before Easter 1639, and thereafter he was attached to the Cockpit.³

Nothing further is known of the affairs of this troupe until 10 August 1639. On that date the Lord Chamberlain issued the following edict:

Wheras William Bieston Gent' Gouuernor &c' of the Cockpitt Playes appropriated [*sic*] the kinges and Queenes young Company of Players at the Cockpitt in Drury Lane hath represented vnto his Ma^{tye} that y^e seuerall Playes heerafter mentioned (vizt) Witt without money. The Night Walkers: The Night of the burning pestill Fathers owne sonne Cupids

¹ Hotson, p. 93.

² M.S.C. II. 389.

³ Andrews, *Brome*, pp. 13-15. Brome had, however, written one or two plays for the Cockpit before this time in spite of his contract with the Salisbury Court. He seems to have been very friendly with William Beeston. (See 'Players'.)

Reuenge. The Bondman. The Renegado: A new way to pay debts The great Duke of Florence The maid of honor: The Traytor: The Example: The young Admirall. The oportunity: A witty fayre one: Loues cruelty The wedding the Maids reuenge: The Lady of pleasure The schoole of complement: The gratefull seruant: The Coronation: Hide parke. Philip Chabot Admirall of France: A mad couple well mett Alls Lost by Lust The Change-ling: A fayre quarrell: The spanish gipsie The World The Sunnes Darling Loues Sacrifice Tis pittty shee's a Whore George a greene: Loues M^{rs}. The Cunning Louers The rape of Lucrece A trick to cheat the Duell: A foole & her maydenhead soone parted King Iohn & Matilda A Citty night cap. The bloody banquet: Cupids Vagaries: The conceited Duke & Appius & Virginia doe all & euery of them properly & of right belong to the sayd House, and consequently that they are all in his propriety: And to the end that any other Companies of Actors in or about London shall not p^rsume to act any of them to y^e preiudice of him the said William Bieston and his Company: his Ma^{ty} hath signified his royall pleasure vnto me. therby requireing mee to declare soe much to all other Companyes of Actors heerby concernable that they are not any wayes to intermedle wth or Act any of th'aboue mentioned Playes: Wherof I require all Masters & Gouernors of Playhouses & all others whome it may concerne to take notice & to forbear to impeach the sayd W^m Bieston in y^e Premisses as they tender his Ma^{tes} displeasure and will answere the Contempt. Giuen &c' Aug 10. 1639¹

This list of plays evidently represents the repertory of the King and Queen's young company in August 1639. It demonstrates that the Beestons had retained a large part of the repertory of the Queen's company at the Cockpit,² and it is probable, as has been suggested,³ that the Lord Chamberlain's order was directed primarily at Queen Henrietta's company, who are not likely to have resigned themselves to their loss with the best grace.⁴ It may be, however, that Beeston was also seeking protection from the King's men, who seem to have played *Monsieur Thomas*, the *Fathers owne sonne* of this list.⁵

On the same day, 10 August 1639, there is noted in the

¹ M.S.C. II. 389-90

² About seventy plays of the repertory of Queen Henrietta's from 1625 to 1642 are known (see above, pp. 250-9). Thirty of these plays, including most of the best ones, are in Beeston's list

³ Murray, I. 268.

⁴ From the viewpoint of a modern scholar, this conjectural difficulty between Queen Henrietta's men and Beeston seems an ideal subject for a suit.

⁵ See M.S.C. I. 364-5, and p. 62 above.

Lord Chamberlain's warrant books a ticket of privilege for certain actors of 'y^e young Company of [*sic*] at y^e Cockpitt Players (vizt) Robert Axon William Trig: Iohn Lacie: Iohn Page, Michael Moone: Robert Coxe: Edward Dauenport: Ezechiel Fenne. Robert Shatterell: Edward Gibbes: Iohn Wright Samuel Manuray'.¹

It is not easy to determine just what this certificate indicates. Only two other instances of the issue of tickets of privilege to groups of players in our period are known.² In both these cases the players are designated as hired men or attendants. It may be that the men named in the certificate had the same status, but several of them had had no little experience as actors: Gibbs had previously been a leader of the King's Revels, and Moone is several times mentioned as a leader of the King and Queen's young company. Moreover, the list includes all the known actors of the company except William Beeston, George Stutville, and Theophilus Bird. As governor, Beeston needed no additional protection. Stutville may have been similarly protected, as he had been a company leader for years.³ Bird had probably gone to the King's men by this time.⁴ I am inclined to think that this certificate records a complete list of the adults of the company with the exception of Beeston and Stutville.

William Beeston was less fortunate than his father in keeping in the good graces of Sir Henry Herbert—and the Master of the Revels was a very important factor in the lives of theatrical managers. In the spring of 1640 the King and Queen's young company, like so many others before them, attempted to tickle the popular fancy with a play which had the impertinence to indulge in political comment. This in itself was dangerous, but the company went farther and neglected to submit the play to the Master of the Revels, thereby adding insult to indiscretion.

Officialdom descended in wrath upon them. The Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book records their shortcomings and hints at other misdeeds:

Vnlicensed Playes restrayned	Wheras William Bieston and the Company of Players of the Cockpitt in Drury Lane haue lately Acted a new play w th out any Licence from the M ^r of his Ma ^{tes} Reuells & beeing cōmaunded to forbear
---------------------------------	--

¹ *M.S.C.* ii. 390-1.

³ See 'Players'.

² *Ibid*, pp. 380 and 394

⁴ See King's, pp. 56-7.

playing or Acting of the same play by the sayd Mr of the Reuells & commaunded likewise to forbear all manner of playing haue notwithstanding . . . Acted the sayd Play & others. . . Theis are therfore in his Ma^{tes} name, & signification of his royall pleasure to cōmaund the sayd Wiłm Bieston & the rest of that Company of the Cockpitt Players from henceforth & vpon sight heerof to forbear to Act any Playes whatsoever vntill they shall bee restored by the sayd Mr of the Reuells vnto their former Liberty. Wherof all partyes concernable are to take notice & to conforme accordingly as they and euery of them will answere it at their [*sic*]. Giuen &c' at Whitehall the 3^d. of May 1640/

To Willam Bieston. George
Estoteville¹ & the rest of the Com-
pany of the Players at the Cockpitt
in Drury Lane./²

And this document is followed by another, more vigorously expressive of official displeasure:

App ^r hension & Cōmittm ^t	A warr ^t of app ^r hension & cōmittm ^t to the Marshallseas of William Bieston, George Estote- vill & [<i>blank</i>] Moone vpon y ^e aboue specified Occasion. eod ³
--	---

Sir Henry Herbert's own record of this affair adds a little more to our knowledge. He seems not entirely displeased at the turn of events.

'On Monday the 4 May, 1640,⁴ Wilham Beeston was taken by a messenger, and committed to the Marshalsey, by my Lord Chamberlens warrant, for playinge a playe without license. The same day the company at the Cockpitt was commanded by my Lord Chamberlens warrant to forbear playinge, for playinge when they were forbidden by mee, and for other disobedience, and laye still monday, tuesday, and wensday On thursday at my Lord Chamberlen's entreaty I gave them their liberty, and upon their petition of submission subscribed by the players, I restored them to their liberty on thursday.

'The play I cald for, and, forbiddinge the playinge of it, keepe the booke, because it had relation to the passages of the K.s journey into the Northe, and was complaynd of by his M.^{tye} to mee, with commande to punishe the offenders.'⁵

The Master of the Revels indicates that the company did not long remain in disgrace. But what of Beeston? It was probably well known that he was chiefly responsible for the

¹ A variant of Stutville.

² M.S.C. ii. 393-4

³ Ibid., p. 394.

⁴ Probably Herbert meant 5 May, as 4 May 1640 was a Sunday.

⁵ Herbert, p. 66.

company's scandalous conduct, and Sir Henry's account does not have a generous or forgiving tone. One imagines that Beeston was allowed to pine in the Marshalsea for a time.

It must be his detention which Richard Brome refers to in the epilogue to *The Court Beggar* ¹

There's wit in that now. But this small Poet vents none but his own, and his by whose care and directions this Stage is govern'd, who has for many yeares both in his fathers dayes, and since directed Poets to write & Players to speak till he traund up these youths here to what they are now. I some of 'em from before they were able to say a grace of two lines long to have more parts in their pates then would fill so many Dry-fats And to be serious with you, if after all this, by the venemous practise of some, who study nothing more then his destruction, he should faile us, both Poets and Players would be at losse in Reputation.²

Unfortunately we do not know what Brome meant by 'the venemous practise of some', but whoever they were [Davenant?], success seems to have attended their evil schemes, for Beeston was ousted from his position as governor of the company and William Davenant installed in his place. The wording of Davenant's appointment indicates that Beeston had not returned to his governorship and may well have been still in prison. The Lord Chamberlain says,

Mr Dauenant Gouuernor of the Cockpitt Players	Whereas in y ^e Playhouse or Theatre cōmonly called the Cockpitt in Drury Lane there are A Company of Players or Actors Authorized by mee (as L ^d Chamberlaine to his Ma ^{tye}) to play or Act vnder the Title of the Kinges or Queenes seruantes and that by reason of some disorders lately amongst them cōmitted they are disabled in their seruice & Quality. These are therefore to signifie that by the same Authority I doe authorize and appoint William Dauenant Gent' one of her Ma ^{tes} seruantes in mee and my name, to take into his Gou'nmt & care, the sayd Company of Players, to gouerne, order & dispose of them for Action and p ^r sentmentes, and all their Affayres in the sayd House, as in his discretion shall seeme best to conduce to his Ma ^{tes} seruice in that Quality. And I doe heerby inioyne & cōmaund them all, and euery of them that are soe authorized to play in the sayd House vnder the preuiledge of his or her Ma ^{tes} seruantes, and euery one belonging
---	---

¹ Fleay (*Biog. Chron.* 1 40-1) has shown conclusively, in my opinion, that the title-page of this play must be in error as to both date of performance and company. The epilogue quoted above, taken with the evidence from the Wallace suit that Brome was writing for Beeston at the Cockpit in 1639 and after (corroborative evidence which Fleay knew nothing of), seems to me to indicate quite clearly that Brome wrote this play for Beeston and Their Majesties' Servants. ² *Five New Plays* (1653), S₈ and S₈^v.

as prentices or servantes to those Actors to play vnder the sayd p^riviledge that they obey the sayd Mr Dauenant & follow his Orders & direccōns as they will answere the contrary. Which power or previllege Hee is to continue & inioye during that lease which Mr^s Elizabeth Bieston alias Hucheson hath or doth hold in the sayd Playhowse. Provided Hee bee still accomptable to mee for his care & well ordering the sayd Company. Given vnder my hand and seale the 27th of Iune 1640 P & M.¹

The phrasing of this order suggests that Davenant was expected to take permanent charge of the company, but the Lord Chamberlain could not take future political events into account. About ten months after his appointment Davenant was involved in the Army Plot with Suckling and Jermyn, and on 6 May 1641 he fled with the others.² He was captured, and brought back to London. There are varying accounts of his activities thereafter, and no record of Parliament's final disposition of his case. By July 1642 he was in The Hague and had probably left England some time before.³ While involved in desperate political adventures of this sort, Davenant certainly had no time for the King and Queen's company. Probably Beeston was reinstated some time between the revelation of the Army Plot and the end of the year, for one of the Lord Chamberlain's books entitled 'Establishment list of Servants of the Chamber in 1641' has under the head 'Revells' this entry: 'Gouernor of y^e Cockpitt Players William Bieston.'⁴

This is the last mention of the company I can find. Presumably they continued to play at the Cockpit, except when the plague was bad.⁵ If Richard Brome may be trusted, the last play they acted before the war was *The Jovial Crew*, for in the dedication to Thomas Stanley in the 1652 quarto of the play (whose title-page indicates that it was 'Presented in a Comedie, at The Cock-pit in Drury-Lane, in the yeer 1641'), Brome says, '*All the Arguments I can use to induce you to take notice of this thing of nothing, is, that it had the luck to tumble last of all in the Epidemicall ruine of the Scene.*'

The career of the King and Queen's young company was ended, like that of all other London companies, by the Parliamentary decrees of 2 September 1642.⁶

¹ M.S.C. ii. 395.

³ Nethercot, *D'avenant*, pp. 188-98.

⁵ See Plague Appendix, pp. 665-7.

² Gardiner, ix. 360.

⁴ M.S.C. ii. 326.

⁶ See Appendix, p. 690.

ACTOR LISTS

<i>Actors</i>	<i>Summoned for playing during Plague 12 May 1637^a</i>	<i>Named in ticket of privilege 10 Aug 1639^b</i>	<i>Imprisoned for acting unlicensed play 3 May 1640^c</i>	<i>Acted in Love's Cruelty > 1642^d</i>
Christopher Beeston	1		.	
William Beeston	2	.	1	
Theophilus Bird	3	.		
Ezekiel Fenn	4	8	.	
Michael Mohun (Moone)	5	5	3	Bellamente
Robert Axen	.	1
William Trigg		2	.	
John Lacy		3		.
John Page	.	4		
Robert Cox	.	6	.	
Edward Davenport	.	7	..	.
Robert Shatterell	.	9	.	.
Edward Gibbs	.	10	..	.
John Wright	..	11	..	.
Samuel Mannery	.	12	..	.
George Stutville	.	..	2	
Nicholas Burt	Clariana

^a M S C 1 392.^b Ibid n. 390-1^c Ibid. n. 394.^d Hist Hist., p. 3. See Appendix, p. 692.

BEESTON'S BOYS' PLAYS AT COURT

<i>Production date</i>	<i>Plays given</i>	<i>Amt</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Source</i>
> 10 May 1637	2 ^a	£20	10 May 1637 ^b	M S C. n. 383
7 Feb. 1636/7	<i>Cupid's Revenge</i>	Herbert, p. 57
14 Feb. 1636/7	<i>Wit without Money</i>	Ibid., p. 58
> 12 Jan. 1637/8 ^c	<i>The Cid</i>	1637 t p.
> 11 Jan. 1638/9 ^d	<i>Argalus and Parthenia</i>	1639 t p.
> 4 Apr. 1640 ^e	<i>The Ladies' Privilege</i>	.	..	1640 t p.
> 22 May 1640 ^f	<i>The Hollander</i>	.	..	1640 t p.
?	<i>The Sun's Darling</i>	.	.	1656 t p.

^a Probably the plays were the two immediately following.^b Christopher Beeston was payee for these two plays 'Acted by the new Company' and for nine plays acted by the Queen's company in 1635, both payments being authorized in the same warrant^c Herbert licensed the play for the press 12 Jan. 1637/8 (1637 edition), and his licence says it had already been acted at court.^d The play was entered S R. 11 Jan. 1638/9.^e The play was entered S R. 4 Apr. 1640.^f The play was entered S.R. 22 May 1640.

THE REPERTORY OF BEESTON'S BOYS¹

BEAUMONT and FLETCHER. *The Coronation*. (See JAMES SHIRLEY)

— *Cupid's Revenge*. 1st ed 1615, the title-page of that and of the second edition (1630) says that it had been acted by the Children of the Revels, but it was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, pp 330-1). Acted at court 28 December 1624 by Lady Elizabeth's (*Herbert*, p 52) and 7 February 1636/7 by Beeston's Boys (*ibid*, p 57)

— *Father's Own Son* (See *Monsieur Thomas*.)

— *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. 1st ed 1613 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 330) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 250)

— *Monsieur Thomas* 1st ed 1639, the title-page says, 'Acted at the Private House in Blacke Fryers'. Reissued in the Restoration, N D, with a new title-page entitled *Father's Own Son*, under which title it was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 330). Sir Edmund Chambers suggests (*M.S.C.* 1. 364) that it may have been the appropriating of this play by the King's men which led to the protection for Beeston's Boys by the Lord Chamberlain

— *The Night Walker, or The Little Thief*. 1st ed 1640 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 330) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 250).

— *Wit without Money*. 1st ed. 1639 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 330). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 250).

BROME, ALEXANDER. *The Cunning Lovers*. 1st ed., 1654; the title-page says, 'As it was Acted, with great Applause, by their Majesties Servants at the private House in Drury Lane' Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 331).

BROME, RICHARD *The Court Beggar* 1st ed 1653 in *Five New Plays*, the title-page says, 'Acted at the Cock-pit, by his Majesties Servants, Anno 1632'. But this ascription to King's is certainly wrong, as Fleay has pointed out (*Brog. Chron.* i 40-1) The King's men were never at the Cockpit. The prologue speaks of Brome as old, which he was not in 1632, and it alludes to the courtiers' plays and their gaudy scenes. These plays were written 1634-9. The epilogue refers

¹ There is evidence of ownership but not of performance by Beeston's Boys for a number of these plays.

Brome, Richard (*cont.*)

by name to two of Brome's own plays, *The Sparagus Garden*, 1635, and *The Antipodes*, 1638. Finally the epilogue refers quite clearly to William Beeston and Their Majesties' Servants as the actors of the play and apparently to Christopher Beeston as dead (d. 1638) and to William Beeston's arrest in May 1640 (see above, pp. 333-4).

— *A Jovial Crew* 1st ed. 1652, the title-page says, 'Presented in a Comedie, at The Cock-pit in Drury-Lane, in the year 1641'.

— *A Mad Couple Well Matched* 1st ed. 1653 in *Five New Plays* with no indication of company or theatre, but see ANONYMOUS, *A Mad Couple Well Met*.

CHAPMAN, GEORGE *Chabot, Admiral of France*. (See CHAPMAN and SHIRLEY.)

CHAPMAN and SHIRLEY. *Chabot, Admiral of France*. 1st ed. 1639.

Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 251).

D, T. (See ANONYMOUS, *The Bloody Banquet*)

DAVENPORT, ROBERT. *The City Night Cap*. 1st ed. 1661. As 'A City night cap', protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 251).

— *A Fool and Her Maidenhead Soon Parted*. (See ANONYMOUS)

— *King John and Matilda*. 1st ed. 1655. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 251).

— *A New Trick to Cheat the Devil* 1st ed. 1639; the title-page gives no indication of company or theatre. 'A trick to cheat the Diuell', protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331), is probably this play.

FLETCHER, JOHN. (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER)

FORD, JOHN. *The Lady's Trial*. 1st ed. 1639; the title-page says, 'Acted By both their Majesties Servants at the private house in Drury Lane'. Licensed 3 May 1638 for the Cockpit. (*Herbert*, pp. 37-8.)

— *Love's Sacrifice*. 1st ed. 1633; protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 252).

— *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. 1st ed. 1633. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 252).

FORD and DEKKER. *The Sun's Darling* 1st ed. 1656, the title-page says, 'As it hath been often presented at Whitehall,

by their Majesties Servants; and after at the Cock-pit in *Drury Lane*, with great Applause.' Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Lady Elizabeth's (see above, p. 195).

GLAPTHORNE, HENRY. *Argalus and Parthenia*. 1st ed. 1639, the title-page says, 'As it hath been Acted at the Court before their Maesties: And At the Private-House in Drury-Lane, By their Maesties Servants'.

— *The Hollander*. 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'A Comedy written 1635 . . . And now Printed as it was then Acted at the Cock-pit in Drury lane, by their Majesties Servants, with good allowance. And at the Court before both their Majesties' Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 252).

— *The Ladies' Privilege* 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'As it was Acted with good allowance at the Cock-pit in Drury-lane, And before their Majesties at White-Hall twice By their Majesties Servants'.

— *Wit in a Constable*. 1st ed. 1640, the title-page says, 'A Comedy written 1639 . . . And now Printed as it was lately Acted at the Cock-pit in Drury lane, by their Majesties Servants, with good allowance'.

GREENE, ROBERT. *George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield*. (See ANONYMOUS)

HEYWOOD, THOMAS *Love's Mistress* 1st ed. 1636. 'Loues Mrs.' protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 253).

— *The Rape of Lucrece* 1st ed. 1608. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Anne's and Queen Henrietta's (see above, pp. 174 and 253).

MASSINGER, PHILIP *The Bondman*. 1st ed. 1624. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Lady Elizabeth's (see above, p. 195).

— *The Great Duke of Florence*. 1st ed. 1636. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 254).

— *The Maid of Honor*. 1st ed. 1632. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 254).

— *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* 1st ed. 1633. 'A new way to pay debts.' protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's

Massinger, Philip (*cont*)

Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 254).

— *The Renegado* 1st ed. 1630 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 254)

MIDDLETON and ROWLEY *The Changeling*. 1st ed 1653 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 331) Formerly property of Lady Elizabeth's (see above, p 196)

— *A Fair Quarrel* 1st. ed 1617 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Prince Charles I's company (see above, p 215).

— *The Spanish Gypsy* 1st ed. 1653 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's and Lady Elizabeth's (see above, pp 255 and 196)

— *The World Tossed at Tennis* (See ANONYMOUS.)

NABBES, THOMAS *The Bride*. 1st ed 1640; the title-page says, 'Acted in the yeere 1638. at the private house in Drury-lane by their Majesties Servants'.

ROWLEY, WILLIAM. *All's Lost by Lust* 1st ed. 1633 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Lady Elizabeth's and Queen Henrietta's (see above, pp 196 and 256)

— *Hymen's Holiday, or Cupid's Vagaries*. Not extant 'Cupids Vagaries.' protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p 256).

RUTTER, JOSEPH. *The Cid* 1st ed. 1637, the title-page says, 'And acted before their Majesties at Court, and on the Cock-pit Stage in Drury-lane, by the servants to both their Majesties'. On the verso of the last page of Part I is, 'This Tragicomedy, called, *The Valiant Cid*, translated out of French, as it was acted before the King and Queene at Court, may be printed. Henry Herbert Janu. 12. 1637' Opposite 18, 'Imprimatur. Tho. Wykes. Jan. 26 1637.'

SHIRLEY, JAMES. *The Coronation*. 1st ed. 1640, licensed by Sir Henry Herbert 6 February 1634/5. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly. the property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 257)

— *The Example*. 1st ed. 1637. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 257).

Shirley, James (*cont*)

- *The Grateful Servant*. 1st ed 1630 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 257)
- *Hyde Park* 1st ed 1637 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 257).
- *The Lady of Pleasure* 1st ed 1637 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258)
- *Love's Cruelty*. 1st ed. 1640 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258)
- *The Maid's Revenge*. 1st ed. 1639 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258)
- *The Night Walker* (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER)
- *The Opportunity*. 1st ed 1640. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258)
- *The School of Compliment* 1st ed. 1631 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258)
- *The Traitor* 1st ed 1635. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 258).
- *The Wedding*. 1st ed. 1629 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 259).
- *The Witty Fair One*. 1st ed 1633 Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys (see above, p. 331). Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 259).
- *The Young Admiral*. 1st ed 1637. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys (see above, p. 331) Formerly property of Queen Henrietta's (see above, p. 259).
- WEBSTER, JOHN. *Appius and Virginia*. 1st ed. 1654. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331).
- ANONYMOUS. *The Bloody Banquet*. 1st ed. 1639; 'T D.' is the author. (For exposure of the 'bibliographical ghost' of the 1620 and 1630 editions, see George Watson Cole, in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, xiii [1919], 98-112.)

Anonymous (*cont*)

- Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331).
- *The Conceited Duke*. Not extant. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Fleay identifies this play with Shirley's play *The Duke*, licensed 17 May 1631 (*Biog. Chron.* ii. 237), but his identification is not convincing. (See Nason, *Shirley*, pp. 102-3.)
- *The Father's Own Son* (See BEAUMONT and FLETCHER.)
- *A Fool and Her Maidenhead Soon Parted*. Not extant. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Fleay says that the play was probably Davenport's since it comes between two others of his on the list (*Biog. Chron.* ii. 336.)
- *George-a-Greene* 1st ed. 1599, when the play belonged to the Earl of Sussex's company. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331).
- *A Mad Couple Well Met*. Not extant. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Probably the same as Brome's *Mad Couple Well Matched*, q. v.
- *The World*. Protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston's Boys 10 August 1639 (see above, p. 331). Mr. W. J. Lawrence suggests (*Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*, p. 337) that this may have been Middleton and Rowley's *A Courtly Masque: The Deunce Called, The World tost at Tennis*, printed in 1620 as performed by Prince Charles's (I) company (see above, p. 214).